THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVI MAY, 1938 No. 215

EDITORIAL

Macaulay once wrote in the *Edinburgh Review* that " it would be unjust to estimate Goldsmith by the *Vicar of Wakefield*," when he meant the *History of Greece*. His biographer says, " It is difficult to conceive any calamity which Macaulay would regard with greater consternation than that, in the opening sentences of an article which would be read by everybody who read anything, he should pose before the world for three mortal months in the character of a critic who thought the *Vicar of Wakefield* a bad book." The plight of the much less distinguished Editor of this Journal is not so hard as that, but it is the fact that an Editorial, duly written, mysteriously did not reach the printer, and its absence was not discovered till it was too late to rewrite it all. Much of it was quite dispensable, but it is sad that some little appreciations of Bishop Frere and Dr. Frank Gavin cannot be reconstructed at an hour's notice. It is interesting to conjecture what happened. An envelope comes open in the post, and the contents slip out. The Postmaster-General has no wish to impede the safe delivery of what appear to be observations on Historic Theology at whatever address may desire to have such things. For his own part it may be that he finds them credible and deems them worthy of publication. But " Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding ? " There is no indication in the typescript that (for the purpose in hand) the answer to the question is the Deanery, Exeter.

UNITY IN PUBLIC WORSHIP

MANY changes have come over the public Worship of the Church in the last hundred years. In the larger number of instances it is a recovery of what has always been the rightful heritage of the Church in this land. But there are two most important and well-nigh revolutionary changes that have gradually crept in that are in the real sense of the word novelties. Firstly, the introduction of hymns into our Services. Various causes have contributed to this state of affairs, which need not detain us here. What we have to realize is that the whole structure of the Service has altered and the balance been shifted in the minds of the majority of our people. The like is true of the second great change, the introduction of the Sermon or Address as a normal part of every Service on Sunday, and frequently of any special week-day Service. As a matter of fact we know that the Prayer Book only contemplated a Sermon at the Holy Communion Service, and an Instruction of the children at Evensong. There is much to be said for and against hymns and sermons, but on the whole there is probably a gain. But at the same time there is undoubtedly a grave danger lest the Divine Office be regarded as an appendage to a sort of a liturgical service of hymns and sermon. Any parish priest knows that many of our people judge a service by these two elements—a service is "enjoyed" if the people like the hymns and sermon, and it is unfortunately not unknown for a place of worship deliberately to use these two elements as a bait to attract a congregation. The persistence of bad music in our Churches is to a large extent due to this unworthy desire.

There has arisen then a situation never contemplated by our forefathers. The Offices, as sung on Sundays, have become a series of unrelated episodes, with a conscious or unconscious emphasis on the modern addenda. But we have to recognize that the problem is really a deeper one than this. The very Office itself is not free from this very defect of lack of unity within itself, and, strictly speaking, these additions of hymn and sermon have only made more acute a problem already there. It is well to consider whether some improvement of the situation cannot be found.

At the time of the first English Prayer Book, Cranmer and his followers were strongly influenced by certain ideas, and it

is likely that they did not quite realize the full implications of the changes they proposed to make. They rightly recognized the need for a revision of the system of the recitation of the psalms and the reading of the scriptures, but we may reasonably question whether they fully appreciated the danger of an Office which was piecemeal and without a unified coherence. Whatever may be the demerits of the pre-Reformation Breviary, taking it as a whole, there was a well defined focal point, around which the thoughts of the worshipper might profitably centre and which drove home to him the " theme " of that particular day or season. The elaborate scheme of Antiphon, Chapter and Respond took up the chief point of the liturgical Scriptures in the Mass, and so was secured a unity in the worship of the day.

All this was removed at the Reformation. The new scheme for psalms and lessons certainly brought about regularity and orderliness, but the basis being the civil and not the ecclesiastical year, the result was not altogether happy. Further, the actual lectionary was itself very rigid, and but small provision was made even for the chief Red-Letter Days. The outcome was an invariable structure with variable elements (lessons, psalms and collect), which in most instances bore no relation the one to the other. In addition to this, the invariableness of the structure itself ministered to this end, for the Office on Good Friday was, as regards this part, precisely that of any great festival. Thus a valuable means of marking feast and feria and fast by such points as the recitation or non-recitation of the Preces was lost. Whether the intention of the compilers of the 1549 Book was as rigid as this, or whether they meant some of the older rules to persist, we do not know. However this may be, the Acts of Uniformity gradually brought about a system as rigid as any desired by the most fervent upholder of method, system and order.

That this was vaguely perceived is shewn by the slow increase in special provision for lessons on Sundays and Holy Days up to the Lectionary of 1871. Even then many Red-Letter Days had only a special first Lesson provided, and on the majority of Sundays the second Lesson was governed by the civil Kalendar. The provision of special psalms was still very limited, and psalms of praise might often occur in Holy Week, or the penitential psalms on Trinity Sunday or All Saints' Day. The Revised Lectionary has tried to meet these difficulties, and we now have a much wider latitude which gives some measure of unity to all Offices of important days. But the underlying problem remains, and at the moment we are existing in a state of affairs which is neither the one thing nor the other. We do

not always realize, perhaps, that we have departed from the main principles laid down in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. Most Churches use the special psalms for Sundays, and thus the orderly recitation is broken at least once in seven days. The new basis of the Lectionary—*i.e.*, the ecclesiastical year—causes gaps whenever a Saint's Day occurs in the orderly reading of scripture.

I am not making any attempt to solve this problem, but to plead for the avoiding of a worse confusion. Let us consider an ordinary Sunday Evensong. The Lectionary gives us one or more psalms, and the two lessons; the Prayer Book provides the collect. In addition to these there will be three or more hymns and a sermon. This means at least eight elements, of which four are set for us, and the remainder at the choice of the incumbent. On such a Sunday it is more than likely that there will be four quite diverse elements introduced by the set variable portions from Lectionary and Prayer Book. There are no Antiphons to help us to get a unity into our worship, or to relate it to Mattins or the Holy Communion. It is not practical politics to suggest a complete scrapping of it all, and a return to the system of the Breviary. What, then? Surely, with a little care, we might get some measure of unity by the careful co-ordination of those parts of the service which are under our control—which we may call the "voluntary" parts of the service—*i.e.*, the hymns and sermon. All too frequently we find that the sermon has no relation whatsoever to the Office, and appears to have been composed at random. It goes without saying that from time to time there come days when some special National occasion calls for a discourse on some definite subject, but those exceptional circumstances do not occur with any great frequency. In general, it should be our aim to take up some thought from the lessons or psalms, and expound them in the sermon. It is astonishing how fruitful they are for this purpose, and there is no difficulty in finding fresh points year by year to the same people. Then we may choose the hymns to suggest and support this point. This incidentally involves the cessation of that bad custom of allowing the organist to choose the hymns. It is reasonable to consult him in the choice, but it is most undesirable to leave the whole matter to him—as is far too often done.

By setting about the choice in this way three advantages are secured: (*a*) We direct the worship of the people along one line, and do not leave them bewildered by a number of possible lines. (*b*) We bring these additions to the Office into the structure of the service. No longer are they bits and pieces tacked on as the jam and cake after the bread and butter of

the Office, but they become valuable handmaids to the spiritual significance of the Office. (*c*) They encourage the people to sing intelligently what they sing. The haphazard choice inevitably encourages them to think rather of the tune, and thus most people think only of the tune. A moment's thought will show us that this is highly disproportionate, and that the words are the things that matter, the tune being of great importance in that it must minister to the words and serve to bring out their meaning.

The wider problem will in all probability remain with us, for the whole system contains within itself fundamentally opposed principles. Yet in this way we may appreciably ease the tension, and at the same time harness these additions. They are strictly speaking without any authority, but if we are wise, we shall see that they are made to play their part in the whole.

It will be seen that the whole question of the choice of hymns deserves a wider consideration. We may conveniently divide the subject into four parts, according to the use made of them in the average Church. These are: the hymn at the informal service, the office hymn, the additional hymns at Morning or Evening Prayer, the hymns at the Sung Eucharist. This covers the greater part of the ground, as such occasions as Weddings and Funerals need no discussion.

(1) These informal services are of two kinds. There is the Guild Service, when some form of Office is frequently used. Many of such Offices are constructed more like the pre-Reformation service rather than the present Offices, and they therefore already have a well defined unity of theme. Any hymns added will quite naturally have reference to this point, and the priest conducting the service can make a suitable choice. The other type of service is what is commonly called a Mission Service. Here usually there is no set form at all, and often the emphasis is on the sermon. It clearly calls for a very careful choice of hymns, but here a word must be said about the sort of hymn chosen. Many hymn-books include a section headed Mission Hymns. It is difficult to see why a service which has as its express object the winning of men and women for Christ should be considered as a suitable occasion for the singing of sentimental doggerel to weak, sugary tunes. It is nothing more than a deliberate appeal to the lowest emotions of mankind, and it can only result in an effeminate and maudlin frame of mind on the part of the congregation. If Christianity is a strong and virile religion, it seems inexcusable to tempt people to become Christians by displaying a false form of sentimentality in our music.

(2) The Office Hymn is one to be distinguished from the other hymns in our Services. It belongs to the ancient tradition of the Church, and is of particular value in giving unity to the Office. It is all to the good that its use is gradually spreading, and that it is ceasing to be thought of as "High Church." Both the English Hymnal and Hymns A. & M. print the old Office hymn for the different seasons; and the proprietors of Hymns A. & M. also publish a special collection of the hymns. We cannot, however, help asking whether it is really necessary to limit the choice of these hymns to this set number. Undoubtedly many of the ancient hymns are magnificent (nobody could want to get rid of the "Vexilla regis"), but others might be decently allowed to drop. It is a pity to suggest that nothing worthy of a place within the Office itself can be produced to-day. It savours of the attitude caricatured by W. S. Gilbert in *Patience*: "Art stopped short In the cultivated court Of the Empress Josephine." Especially is this true of the Ferial Sunday Office Hymn. "Lucis creator optime" is not the happiest example of good poetry in the Latin; Neale did nothing to improve it in his translation in E.H. 51. It becomes well-nigh intolerable for Sunday after Sunday in the Trinity season, and we may surely seek relief by substituting one of the good evening hymns which are to be found in all our hymn-books. The same is true of other occasions. We ought to be prepared to place here the very best of the appropriate hymns at our disposal, for only those should appear in the very centre of Divine Worship.

(3) In the consideration of the additional hymns at both Morning and Evening Prayer we come to the crux of the matter. Firstly, let us rule out altogether that common intruder, the opening hymn, frequently miscalled the Processional, with its twin brother the so-called Recessional. We shall speak of the true Processional hymn below; here we refer to the hymn sung usually while the Choir is moving to or from the Chancel. It requires no elaborate argument to shew that the quiet beginning of the Office is not a suitable sequel to a hymn which, more often than not, is a hymn of praise. It is no defence at all to say that the people like it; how are we ever to teach an intelligent participation in worship, if we encourage practices which introduce factors which are at war with the main scheme of the service? The sooner this custom dies, the better it will be. As to the other hymns, it will probably not be always possible to choose three which have reference to the point which forms the subject of the sermon. But there should be no real difficulty in finding at least one which will serve this purpose. Here the printing of

texts at the head of the hymn, as is done in Hymns A. & M., is a useful aid both to the priest and to the people. On feasts and fasts, the matter almost settles itself, as there is usually to be found a sufficient number of hymns specially grouped, under the appropriate section of the hymn-book in use. The ordinary Sunday hymns may take a little longer to choose, but it is surely well worth while to give an extra quarter of an hour to achieve this unification of the Office both with itself, and with the addenda to itself. There are, of course, other points to be borne in mind. For instance, the Collection hymn must be long enough to allow for the alms being taken, and, further, this particular hymn becomes a farce if it be of a quiet devotional character. A glaring example of what ought not to be was the singing in a certain Church of "Saviour, when in dust to Thee" as the Collection hymn. It may be objected that some such hymn is desirable after the sermon on certain occasions. Then we can always have the alms taken at some other point in the service. There is no peculiar connection between the third hymn and the Collection.

(4) The hymns at the Sung Eucharist are in a different category, for they are usually sung in the position of the old liturgical "Propers." Although the Prayer-Book does not give them specific mention, we may reasonably assume that the intention of the Compilers was that the Introit, Gradual, Offertory and Communion should continue. In fact, Introits were printed in the 1549 Book. Some hold that these musical portions of the service should be that of the old "Propers," and if that is strongly held, then they can be easily used from the English Hymnal. But the greater number of Churches use here the ordinary hymns, as it seems a little pedantic in outlook to suppose that we must always abide by the customs of the Middle Ages. We must, however, bear in mind that these hymns are integral parts of the Service and therefore demand the most careful choice. (*a*) They must never be allowed unduly to delay the action of the Service. Their origin was probably to cover certain necessary ceremonial acts, and this we must always bear in mind. If we cannot find hymns short enough for the Gradual and Communion, then they may be curtailed, with due regard to the sense of the words. (*b*) Frequently the Gradual hymn can be chosen to fit in with the liturgical Scriptures—*e.g.*, on Advent II. the obvious hymn at this point is "Lord, Thy word abideth," and on Quinquagesima Sunday "Gracious Spirit, Holy Ghost." (*c*) In certain seasons of the year, there are some of the suggested hymns that call for a little care in their use, in that they have a definite reference to one particular Sunday. This applies to several

of the Advent hymns. "Hark, the glad sound" and "On Jordan's bank" clearly belong to Advent III., while "When clothed in flesh the Incarnate Word" is best kept for Advent IV. The rhymed version of the Great Antiphons ("O come, O come, Emmanuel") should not be sung before the day in the Kalendar, O Sapientia (December 16). Similar considerations apply to some of the hymns for the Epiphany. It goes without saying that these suggestions should also be applied to the hymns chosen for the Offices. (*d*) The hymn after the Blessing is in a somewhat different position, as it is not the representative of one of the old Propers. It is a moot point whether or not it is desirable, and there is much to be said for the opinion that the Service should end with the Blessing. But its use is so wide-spread that it would probably be impossible to remove it now. It should be a hymn of thanksgiving, and as such is not palpably out of place. Even in Lent this character should be observed, and one of the quieter hymns of praise be chosen.

There remains the Procession, that is the hymn sung before the Eucharist, or after the Office (but before the Blessing), while Choir and Clergy perambulate the Church. The revival of this ancient custom of the Church is much to be desired, and it usually proves to be very popular with the congregation. This subject is admirably dealt with in a Tract by the Rev. C. D. Dunlop, published by the Alcuin Club, and the reader may be referred to that. Here we may just say that the hymn for a Procession should have good, strong words and an equally good, strong melody. It is best sung in unison, and it should therefore not be pitched too high, as then the basses in the choir are reduced to silence. Most hymn-books include a number of suitable hymns for this purpose, but particularly *Songs of Praise*. For the Procession before the Sung Eucharist much more use might be made of the Litany. Some who read this will have heard it used in Chichester Cathedral, and will know how impressive it sounds. It is a great pity that we so rarely hear the beautiful Advent Prose "Rorate caeli," which is printed in the English Hymnal, number 734. It has a lovely melody, and makes a most fitting introduction to the Sung Eucharist on those four Sundays.

We have tried to see how a unity can be achieved in our services by careful choice of hymns. Let us venture to consider one other small point. There is a way in which a yet further unity can be found, and this concerns the organist rather than the incumbent. To many who have a very keen musical ear, it is extremely distracting, and also very likely to upset continuity, if there is a wild variety of key-signature throughout the service. This is particularly so in the case of the Office

Hymn and the Magnificat, and there should always be key relation here. But elsewhere the reciting note need not always by G (G sharp or even A are really much better for voices to sing); and any organist worth his salt can do a little transposition. Those who find this difficult can often find a tune set in several different keys in the same book. The man with a musical ear perceives a wonderful measure of unity in this way, and many who do not possess a technical knowledge are conscious of this unity, although they may not know the reason for their satisfaction.

These few practical suggestions are offered to help us in our great work of leading the worship of our people, and helping them to give the glory to God.

W. P. Gilpin.

SOME RELIGIOUS REACTIONS IN THE NEAR EAST

The main concern of this article is with the traditional centre of Orthodoxy, Constantinople, as it may still be called for serious religious purposes. The last ten to fifteen years have seen such changes in the Near East as can only be equalled by the events in the fourth century which made Byzantium the capital of the Roman Empire. Those changes are familiar to us from an historical point of view; they are part of the story of the emergence of modern Turkey after the tragic days of the dissolution of the old Ottoman Empire. It is also generally realized that the prestige and temporal power of the Œcumenical See is reduced to a position of comparative impotence, that it still exists and functions, but at the lowest ebb, and in fear of even further humiliation and diminution. It is perhaps not so generally clear, however, that behind the present situation powerful reactions are at work, and such as mark out this present day as critical for the Christian religion in that very region of the world where it first took root and spread among the non-Jewish peoples of the early centuries of the Christian era. The old centres of emphasis have been changing slowly. We may say now that they have definitely changed. In the seventh and eighth centuries, during the fury and scourge of the Arab conquests, the apostolic centres of the Near East, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, as well as those of Asia Minor, lost their supremacy of importance, and a new equilibrium was reached in the primacy of Constantinople, imposed it is true by the imperial power some centuries earlier,

obscured by what happened after Chalcedon, but more natural and inevitable for Orthodoxy than the historian is always ready to admit. That primacy remained as a vital principle until the end of the Great War. Contrary to accepted belief, it was not fundamentally dislocated by the Turkish Conquest of the fifteenth century; indeed, had that conquest not taken place, the Œcumenical See must have shared in the final disintegration of the Eastern Empire, and lost its freedom and autonomy. Looking back with less prejudice, we realize that the ruin of that great Christian state is more the responsibility of Western Europe than of its own inherent causes of decay. It received its mortal wound at the hands of the Venetians in the thirteenth century, and only as a result of that, two centuries later at those of Mahomet the Destroyer. Sir Harry Luke in *The Making of Modern Turkey* makes it very plain that the transition from the Byzantine Empire to the Turkish was not the clear-cut catastrophic sword-cut that we like to think it was. The development of the Byzantine Empire may be regarded legitimately as the progressive orientalizing of an originally classical institution. Its magnificence, its sumptuous pomp carried on neither the tradition of the clear air and spare living of the great ages of Hellas nor of the hard severity of the essential Roman temper, but more of that Persian, Asiatic opulence that first entered Europe in conquering guise in the train of Alexander, which revived in the later Roman Empire, and yet again in the glories of Sasanid Persia, in Arab Baghdad, and in the mediæval Cairo of the Arabian Nights. From this angle, the Turkish Conquest is the climax of a process already inherently and continuously present in the Eastern Empire, its final orientalization. The Conquest was from many aspects an accommodation to what preceded it, and the carrying on of an inheritance to which it succeeded. The framework, the methods of rule, the political boundaries, even to an extent the personnel of subordinate rulers, continued, when a rude, nomad tribe inherited the Queen City and an empire stretching from Baghdad to Morocco, and from the Persian Gulf to the Crimea and the Danube. At the time of the actual Conquest, moreover, the Empire had shrunk almost to the confines of the city walls, and the fall of Constantinople was literally the fall of the capital, the rest of Byzantine Near East being already virtually in the power of the enemy. The city fell also because there was a wide-spread belief among the Byzantines themselves that, for religion at least, there was more hope for spiritual freedom and independence under the rule of the Turk than in the hollow shell of the old Empire, where the Faith had been betrayed by the (even partial) acceptance of the

Florence-Ferrara Council and the consequent threat of Roman dominion. The Turban of the Grand Signor was preferable to the Tiara of the Pope. And so, in the main, it turned out. At the time of the Conquest, the patriarchal throne was vacant. But the elective body of the Great Church hastened to fill the vacancy. A layman, sorely against his will, was elected to fill the chair of St. John Chrysostom under the title of Gennadius. To this great ecclesiastic and his successors was extended the patronage and protection of the Conqueror, and not only was his office recognized as far as possible on the old ceremonial lines of Byzantine imperial tradition, but he became, and remained until the break-up of the Turkish Empire, a great officer of state and the representative of the Orthodox Christian Minorities of the Empire. In a real way the continued existence of the Orthodox Church of the East was saved in its old framework for another five centuries, and not only its existence but its independence of the threats of Western Europe. But this is not all. The imperial Turk was ever either a soldier or a Court functionary. The rule and commerce was left much in the hands of the nimbler, abler, more alert Levantine. Sir Harry Luke makes it clear that in reality the condition of the Christian "rayets" was on the whole more enviable than that of the purely Turkish population of the Empire. Indeed, to come to the crisis of modern times, the essential Turk was the last of the elements of Turkey to gain his freedom and independence, under the Kemalist régime. Generation after generation of the simple, hardy peasantry of Anatolia was content to be drafted into the fighting forces, but the work of holding together the immense ramshackle body of the state was virtually that of the non-Turk, who had already gained freedom from military service. This conception of the old Turkish Empire as a completely orientalized and debased form of the Byzantine Empire is quite vital to the understanding of the general situation today, since the new Turkey is the result of a radical revolution by which at last the Turk is to govern his own country as best he can. M. Alexander Pallis, in his recent book *The Anatolian Adventure—and After* goes further. He considers that the Byzantine Empire fell not on Easter Day of 1453, but after the Treaty of Lausanne, when following the tragedy of Smyrna the last remnants of a non-Turkish population were banished from Asia Minor, when the so-called interchange of populations with Greece took place, and a million and a half Greeks left their ancient homes and were absorbed by the modern kingdom of the Hellenes. In the gardens at the foot of Seraglio Point in Istanbul is a symbolic statue, which is arresting in spite of its indifferent

art. Kemal Attatürk, the maker of the new Turkey, stands with his back to the vast congeries of buildings that cover the ancient Acropolis of Byzantium and which we know as the Grand Seraglio, and looks across the waters of the Bosphorus to the new capital Ankara, which has arisen on the uplands of Asia Minor. The day of the corrupting influences of the old blood-drenched capital with its tragic entail, its intolerable weight of history and its unchangeably Greek heart, is gone in the new dawn of promise for a purified Turkish nation. Allowing for the exaggerations of perfervid nationalism, this is a force that is powerful because realistic. The old order has gone.

The first equilibrium which Orthodoxy reached centred upon Constantinople. It was not only a result of the official act of the first Christian emperor, not only the natural working out of the ecclesiastical situation in the Near East, but above all it is based on Œcumenical conciliar authority. The main considerations of this article are intended to emphasize the quite important fact that once again in Orthodoxy's long history, the interior forces of her life are gathering up to meet the situation brought about by a new order, and are working towards a new equilibrium. The broad factors stand out clearly. Interiorly, there is the liberation and rise of the new Balkan nationalities and rivalries, so important to Orthodoxy with Orthodoxy's insistence on the homogeneity of a nation with its religion; there is the strong and understandable insistence of the historical Greek element in the Church on its ancient but now contested claims to hegemony and jurisdiction, and yet under the stress of the sad plight of the Œcumenical See today. Further there is the dislocation that follows the awful Russian tragedy and the temporary eclipse of the great Russian Orthodox Church. Herein are the powerful constituents of inner tension and strain. And exteriorly Orthodoxy today stands revealed to the outside world in a way that has not happened in her history before. The walls that hid her, behind which she has to some extent hidden herself, are down. It is at this critical juncture that our relations with her, her relations with us, are tightening and multiplying. It is possible to believe so deeply in her divine character and hidden fundamental powers, in her claim to reveal the original form and pattern of the church of Christ—a form difficult for us Westerns to appreciate because so apparently nebulous, yet elastic and enduring—that there need be little doubt that she will succeed in finding her own health and peace. But to those who are impatient at the checks and the slow pace at which the steps towards final substantive and sacramental union between us

proceed, it is opportune to emphasize the fact that the work of rapprochement is being undertaken in a period of such flux and readjustment as she has never experienced since the very different task was before her of organizing the religion of the empire of the East. We cannot rightly take our own part in our relations with her without sharing some of the tragedy and the transversing of the deep waters through which she herself is now passing. The present difficulties for Orthodoxy to call together a fully representative Œcumenical Council throw her and us back upon the perfectly justifiable course of entering into mutual negotiations between particular autocephalous churches, with the hope that ultimately such a consensus of the opinion of Orthodoxy and ourselves may be reached as will make an Œcumenical decision consequent and inevitable. Meanwhile there is time allowed for the solution of her own problems (and ours), and for understanding one another better. That understanding cannot be just between isolated sympathizers and experts, even less satisfactorily can it be just a stirring of sentiment, but between the general clergy and laity of both churches.

Finally, there is this observation. Almost without exception, vital and sympathetic contact with Orthodoxy produces among us a deep love and veneration for her. For those who will see it, she reveals what we of Western Christianity could hardly have hoped to see: the Faith untouched by those powerful influences and reactions which we call the Renaissance, the Reformation, the regimentation of the Counter-Reformation, and the awakening from the sleep of the eighteenth century. Whether in the withdrawn fastnesses of the superb monasteries of Mount Athos, or in a great metropolitical church, or in some humble village church of the Near East, the majesty is revealed of a religion that has developed by continuous growth rather than by the impetus of reactions, the swing of the pendulum and the predominance of extremes. She is stepping down now into the arena of these new forces, but it is we who need the vision she gives us of the worshipping church, and without her there can never be exhibited to the world the great œcumenical faith and practice of both East and West.

AUSTIN OAKLEY

(*Chaplain to the British Embassy, Istanbul*).

THE GOSPELS AND THE EARLY CHURCH

THERE is no part of the Bible which compares with the Gospels in interest and importance. The Old Testament is read as a background, and its psalms are incorporated into the worship of the church. The Acts and Epistles provide a history of the early days of Christianity and a sketch of its theology. But for Christians of all ages the Gospels containing the records of the life and teaching of Jesus have been invested with an unique significance. During the last hundred years they have been studied with the most meticulous care, and on many points the findings of modern scholarship are generally accepted by the Christians of today. In the light of these findings we may attempt to consider the relation between the Gospels and the early church.

We may begin with a point which is so obvious that it is sometimes forgotten. The church produced the Gospels. The Gospels were the principal literary product of the primitive Christian community. This is a historical fact which cannot be disputed, but it has been obscured owing to the authoritative position which the Bible has attained in the church. For fifteen centuries the church has assigned a supreme authority to the Bible as we have it; in the Anglican formularies, for example, the Bible takes precedence of tradition and reason as the ultimate basis of authority.* As an inevitable consequence of this, the Bible has often been treated in isolation from the church. It has been studied as a devotional manual, it has been used as an armoury of dogmatic weapons by theological controversialists, and it has served as a text-book for moralists and legislators. These uses are all legitimate within their limits, but they all have the defect of giving the impression that the Bible is something which stands outside of the church. That impression is erroneous. The Bible is an integral part of the life of the church, and its Christian section—the New Testament—was produced by the church in order to meet its own needs in the early days. The church wrote the New Testament for its own purposes, and the basis of the New Testament is to be found in the Gospels.

We can find strong support for this view if we think of the writers of the Gospels and of the conditions in which they worked. We may assume without serious risk of error that the writers of the Gospels were not isolated individuals. In one case, at least, this is no baseless assumption. The literary

* See, for example, Articles VI., VIII., XX., and XXI.

evidence indicates that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was also the writer of the Johannine Epistles; and the writer of these Epistles was obviously an important official in a local church. The late Dr. Streeter has pointed out that the Elder is "a person of admitted status."* In 1 John he writes as the spiritual father of a large community (ii. 1, 12, 13, 26; iii. 13; iv. 1-3); in 2 John he addresses a letter of exhortation to a church other than his own (1, 5 and 13); and in 3 John he threatens disciplinary action against Diotrephes, who, as he appears to possess the power to excommunicate, can be nothing less than a local bishop (9-10). No such probable inference can be drawn with regard to the other evangelists, but there is early evidence for the traditions which assign Mark† to the John Mark of the Acts and Epistles, and Luke to the "beloved physician" who was the companion of St. Paul. Eusebius‡ quotes the testimony of Papias to the effect that Mark wrote his gospel on the basis of Peter's reminiscences, and Irenaeus§ refers to Papias as a contemporary of Polycarp, who was martyred in 155.‖ The Muratorian fragment on the Canon, which is usually dated at about 180, contains what is probably the earliest identification of the author of the third Gospel with the companion of St. Paul.¶ The authorship of Matthew is a debatable subject, and it is highly improbable that, in the form in which we have it, it came from the pen of the apostle whose name is associated with it. Dr. Streeter, however, has pointed out that each of the Gospels must have been written for the use of some local church, and that anonymous works of this kind would not gain an initial standing in the various communities unless they were produced by persons regarded with confidence and trust.** It is reasonable to argue that this Gospel also, like the other three, is the work of one who took an active part in the life of one or more of the churches. We can be fairly certain that the writers of the four Gospels did not stand outside the main current of church life in their own day. They were no individual investigators each working in solitude on his own piece of specialized research. On the contrary, they were active members of the various Christian communities, who were engaged in the task of spreading the

* B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*. London, 1929, p. 68. See also pp. 83-89.

† The names without the prefix are used to denote the Gospels.

‡ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii. 39.

§ Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, v. 33, 4.

‖ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. Second edition, London, 1889, vol. i., pp. 646-722.

¶ F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. ii. London, 1922, pp. 210-211 and 255-260.

** B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*. London, 1924, pp. 11-12 and 500-502.

good news throughout the Roman world. The Gospels which they produced were by-products of their normal ecclesiastical activity, which was primarily missionary in character. They wrote for the churches in which they were themselves prominent workers.

The same conclusion is reached if we consider the conditions in which their writing was done. During the last hundred years, the main achievement of New Testament scholarship has been to solve the Synoptic problem. We may now take for granted the two fundamental findings which constitute the solution: the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark, and the use by the two later writers of the document "Q." These two conclusions have been set upon such a firm basis by scholars like Harnack and Hawkins that they may be regarded not as speculative conjectures but as scientific hypotheses commanding general acceptance. The writers of Matthew and Luke incorporated the greater part of Mark in their own Gospels, and also in like manner drew largely from an early collection of material which consisted mainly of the sayings of Jesus. The nature of the sources used by the author of the Fourth Gospel is largely a matter of conjecture, but there can be no question that the writer was well acquainted with the earlier Gospels, and that he assumed a similar knowledge on the part of his readers. He refers incidentally to Peter (i. 40), to the imprisonment of the Baptist (iii. 24), and to the Twelve without giving any account of their choice or appointment by Jesus (vi. 67). He certainly intended his work to be regarded as a supplement to the existing writings. It is impossible to isolate his sources as in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, but there is much force in the contention of Archbishop Bernard and Dr. Streeter that the writer of John depended on Mark for some of his narratives.* The sources of the earliest Gospel are mainly a matter of conjecture; but it is probable that the writer of Mark had some at least of his material in written form; the "little apocalypse" in chapter 13 seems to have circulated originally as an independent unit.† We are justified, then, in saying that the writers of Matthew and Luke worked on a basis of written sources; that the fourth evangelist certainly used the existing records; and that even the writer of Mark made use of written material.

The writers of the Gospels, then, wrote on a basis of sources. It is not untrue to say that two of them, at least, were compilers rather than authors in the strict sense. It is true of all of them

* J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John.* (International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh, 1928, vol. i., pp. xcvi-xcix. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels.* London, 1924, pp. 397-401.

† See B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 491-494.

to say that their Gospels are not arbitrary and individualistic compositions containing nothing but their own reading of the story. They all wrote on a basis of existing tradition; the Synoptic writers following the method of incorporation, while the fourth evangelist may perhaps be described as a commentator rather than a recorder. The tradition on which they all depended was the material common to the various Christian churches; and it was the collective tradition of the Christian society. It was their purpose to provide versions, acceptable to the circles in which they moved, of the accounts of the Master's life, teaching, death and resurrection, given by those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke i. 2). The conditions in which they wrote imposed upon them the obligation of basing their work on the common knowledge of the Christian communities. In one case, at least, the work of the evangelist is explicitly endorsed by the testimony of others who were presumably members of the church for which he wrote (John xxi. 24). The evangelists were not private authorities each offering a highly esoteric account of events known to none but themselves. They were figures of repute in their various churches, and they were concerned to conserve the existing tradition accepted by the church as a whole. Their works were accepted on their own merits in the churches for which they were written, and they must have been accepted, in the first instance, by many who were in a position to check, by personal reminiscence, the accuracy of the information which they contained. The writers worked in and for the communities of which they were members, and they functioned as representatives of the whole body. It is true in no conventional sense to say that the church produced the Gospels.

But that is not the whole story. The Gospels were not only produced by the church, but they were produced for the church. The church produced the Gospels for its own specific purpose, and that purpose can be clearly defined: the church produced the Gospels for the edification of its members. That object is emphasized by the fourth evangelist, in the words with which he probably concluded the original version of his Gospel: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John xx. 30-31). A similar purpose is avowed by the writer of Luke, the only one of the evangelists who supplies a detailed statement of his methods and aims. "It seemed good to me also," he says "to write unto thee in order, most excellent

Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed" (i. 3-4). This brief statement throws a flood of light on the purpose of the author. He writes for those who are already members of the church. His work is not intended as a tract to be placed in the hands of an unbeliever; it is written for practising Christians, and is designed to supplement the instruction which they have already received. It may be safely assumed that Theophilus and his fellow-converts were already acquainted with the elements of Christianity; they would know the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, the Apostles' creed in simple form, and they would be familiar with the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. The Gospel is intended to fill a gap in that instruction by providing them with a reliable account of the earthly life and work of the Lord Jesus. It was written "to give Theophilus increased confidence in the faith which he had adopted, by supplying him with further information respecting its historical basis."* We may safely assume that all the evangelists were actuated by a similar aim. They wrote to edify their converts—to build them up in the faith—by bringing them into the closest possible contact with the words and the deeds of the Divine Master whom they venerated as the Founder of the church.

This conclusion is confirmed by a reference to the contents of the Gospels, and we may support it by noting what they omit as well as what they include. It has been often pointed out that the Gospels contain no account of the personal appearance of Jesus, or of His individual idiosyncrasies of speech and action. The sole indication of this kind is the repeated reference in Mark to His habit of looking round on those who were listening to Him (iii. 5 and 34; x. 23). Apart from this one hint we are told absolutely nothing about those personal details, unimportant in themselves, which yet contribute to the painting of a living picture of a historical character. It is needless to emphasize how greatly we should value any such description which would bring Jesus vividly before our imagination, and we may well wonder why the evangelists did not include it for the benefit of their converts. We cannot answer the question by saying that ancient writers were not accustomed to record facts of this kind. We have only to turn to some of the secular writers of the time to find such material in abundance. We may quote, for example, the description of the personal appearance of the Emperor Augustus, given by Suetonius, who wrote early in the second century:

* A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke.* (International Critical Commentary.) Edinburgh, 1910, p. xxxiii.

> "He was unusually handsome and exceedingly graceful at all periods of his life, though he cared nothing for personal adornment. . . . He had clear, bright eyes, in which he liked to have it thought that there was a kind of divine power, and it greatly pleased him, whenever he looked keenly at anyone, if he let his face fall as if before the radiance of the sun; but in his old age he could not see very well with his left eye. His teeth were wide apart, small, and ill-kept; his hair was slightly curly and inclining to golden; his eyebrows met. His ears were of moderate size, and his nose projected a little at the top, and then bent slightly inward. His complexion was between dark and fair. He was short of stature (although Julius Marathus, his freedman and keeper of his records, says that he was five feet and nine inches in height), but this was concealed by the fine proportion and symmetry of his figure, and was noticeable only by comparison with some taller person standing beside him."*

This interesting description, both precise and vivacious, is obviously the work of a biographer. The writer assumes that his subject will possess an inherent interest for his readers, as it does for himself; and he is anxious to set down, in an attractive literary form, all the relevant facts which he has been able to discover. We need only contrast this description with the account in Mark (i. 9) of the first public act of Jesus:

> "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in the Jordan."

Here we are moving in a different world. The narrative is extremely simple—indeed bald—and entirely matter of fact. There is no description of Jesus, no account of the scene at His baptism, and no editorial comment of any kind. The writer is certainly not concerned to discover and set down every available fact. His interest lies not in biographical details about Jesus, but in the message of salvation obtainable through Jesus, and he includes descriptions only in so far as they are required to explain the factual basis of that message. He mentions the baptism because it is part of Jesus' preparation for His Messianic work, but he mentions it in the briefest possible way. This is only one example, but many others

* Suetonius, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe. Vol. i. London and New York, 1914. (The Loeb Classical Library.) The Lives of the Cæsars, Book II.: *The Deified Augustus*, LXXIX. Two sentences have been omitted.

could be selected from any one of the Gospels. They serve to show that for these writers the biographical interest, although not absent, was certainly not paramount. The Gospels are not biographies in the strict sense of the term.

We shall reach a similar conclusion if we consider the Gospels as historical records. We may begin by noting that the Gospels are not scientific histories in the modern sense. It has been said that the writing of scientific history began in the eighteenth century, and it is certainly true that ever since the days of Niebuhr a stringent technique has been developed which was unknown to the writers of ancient and mediæval times. The modern historian is concerned primarily with the facts of the past. He seeks, in the first place, to discover, with as much precision as possible, what these facts were, to estimate the significance of each, and to set them in their true relation to one another. He is careful to distinguish between fact and interpretation, and he has a horror of facile generalizations. His characteristic product is a specialized article or monograph dealing in detail with one particular aspect of a large subject. An interesting and valuable example of modern scientific writing appeared in a recent number of THEOLOGY.* In an article on "Bishop Butler and the Primacy," Dr. Norman Sykes investigated the question, Did Bishop Butler receive an offer of the Primacy on the death of Archbishop Potter in 1747? The article is confined to this one point; the evidence for and against is set out and assessed with scrupulous care; and eventually a conclusion is drawn, not as a matter of certainty, but as a probability indicated by the surviving documents. It is only at the beginning and the end of the article that the writer allows himself a few words on the general bearing of the problem which he discusses.

It is easy to see that the writers of the Gospels did not handle their material in that fashion. They certainly dealt with events in the past, but their primary aim was not to give as full and accurate an account as possible of each event which they selected for treatment. As an example of their defects in this respect we may take the accounts of the last days of Jesus. Each of the four writers devotes a large proportion of his work to an account of these days, and here, if anywhere, we might expect to find general agreement and individual consistency. Yet there can be no denying that there are serious discrepancies and differences in the four accounts. We need only note, by way of example, the question of the relation between the Last Supper and the Passover meal. In the

* THEOLOGY, vol. xxxiii., No. 195 (September, 1936), pp. 132-137.

Marcan account, which is followed in both Matthew and Luke, the Last Supper coincides with the Passover meal, and the crucifixion takes place on the morning after the day on which the official feast began (Mark xiv. 12 and xv. 1). This is intrinsically improbable, because the Jewish authorities would naturally be anxious to avoid any action which might lead to a disturbance on such a day (Mark xiv. 1-2); and the Synoptic accounts are amended by the author of the Fourth Gospel. In John, the Last Supper takes place on the evening of the day before that on which the Passover meal is eaten, and Jesus is arrested, tried, and executed before the beginning of the Feast (John xiii. 1 and 29, xviii. 28). Moreover, we find serious historical defects in the Marcan narrative, even when taken by itself. We can demonstrate this by noting some of the questions which are left unanswered in this account. How is it that Jesus is acclaimed by large crowds in Jerusalem when He has never visited the city before ? Why did such a demonstration fail to provoke the interference of the Roman garrison ? Why was it not brought up at the trial of Jesus ? How is it that on the morning after His arrest the temper of the crowds has completely changed from acclamation to hostility ? Why is it that in Gethsemane Jesus alone was arrested ? Why is it that at His trial no witnesses were found to give consistent testimony to the fact that He had claimed to be the Messiah ? Again, why was Jesus not confronted with Judas at the trial ? And finally, what did Judas betray ? Did he reveal the Messianic claim made by Jesus, or did he merely offer to point out the place on the Mount of Olives where Jesus would be found every night ? These are questions which would certainly be dealt with in any scientific history of the last days of Jesus, and yet they are left unanswered in the earliest Gospel. The only solution to the problem is to be found in the recognition that the evangelist was not concerned primarily with the production of a historical record, clear, self-explanatory, and consistent in its details. The desire to investigate and to record the past for its own sake was not the main motive of his writing, and the same may be said of those who followed him. The writers of the Gospels were not strictly historians, and their writings are not primarily histories.

If then the Gospels are neither biographies nor histories, what are they ? They are the records of the acts of salvation wrought by Jesus, the Divine Redeemer. In their pages Jesus is depicted as a prophet, who declares the will of God for His people and for the world; as a teacher, who explains in memorable fashion the character of God and the true nature of His demands upon men; as a healer whose beneficent

activity extends to the body as well as the soul; and above all, as the Messiah or Redeemer who came to accomplish the divine purpose of the salvation by means of a supreme act of self-sacrifice. The Gospels were written to answer the question, What is the relation between the supreme God and the Christian community? By what right does this religious society claim to have a divine sanction, and to be inspired by a divine influence? The answer to these questions is to be found in the Gospels. Jesus is the connecting link between God and the church, and it is in virtue of His life, death, and resurrection that the church claims to be the agent or instrument by which God seeks to reconcile the world unto Himself. In other words, the Gospels were written by the church for its own specific purpose. They were designed to strengthen the faith of new converts by putting them in full possession of the main facts on which it was based. Hence the Gospels are primarily religious literature. They are written not to entertain nor to inform, but to edify and to redeem.

This conclusion raises the question of the historical value of the Gospel narratives. We have seen that the evangelists were not biographers or historians in the strict sense, but missionaries writing with a religious motive. Now it is a commonplace to say that literature produced for the purpose of edification is indifferent to the canons of strict historical accuracy. We need only turn to the succession of works dealing with St. Francis of Assisi—from the first life by Thomas of Celano to the apocryphal Fioretti—to see that in such writings there is a strong tendency to heighten the miraculous element, at the expense of historical veracity, in the interests of edification.* There is certainly a similar tendency at work in the Gospels. We are all familiar with the way in which the writers of Matthew and Luke alter the text of Mark for reverential reasons,† and we know that the writer of the Fourth Gospel depicts the whole of the earthly life of Jesus as a manifestation of the glory of the Divine Son. All the Four Gospels, as they stand, were the work of believers whose relation to Jesus was one of religious dependence. They were written by and for those who worshipped Him as Lord; and, in spite of the check provided by the first-hand reminiscences of others, they certainly show a tendency to emphasize the Divine aspect of the historical Jesus at the expense of His humanity.

* F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. ii. London, 1922. Appendix A. *The Story of St. Francis of Assisi*, by G. G. Coulton, pp. 438-461. *St. Francis of Assisi*, 1226-1926: *Essays in Commemoration*. London, 1926. Essay by F. C. Burkitt, "The Study of the Sources of the Life of St. Francis," pp. 15-61.

† Compare, for example, Mk. x. 18 with Matt. xix. 17, and Mk. i. 34 with Lk. iv. 40.

There can be no question that this was the dominant tendency of the apostolic age, and it is all the more remarkable, therefore, to find in Mark passages which are contrary to it. We find, for example, the accusation of insanity (iii. 21), the ascription of inability to heal (vi. 5), the doubt cast upon the value of the Davidic descent of the Messiah (xii. 35-37), and the confession of limitation in the knowledge possessed by Jesus (xiii. 32). The inclusion of such passages demonstrates quite definitely that the writer of Mark was largely controlled by his sources, oral or written, which he reproduces faithfully. We may argue further that such reminiscences could have come only from the original followers of Jesus, and that, in whatever form they may have been preserved, it was not such as to destroy their authentic character.* This is a conclusion of great importance. We have argued that the Gospels are neither histories nor biographies in the strict sense, and that the main motive of the writers was neither biographical nor historical. But at the same time we are bound to go to the Gospels for biographical and historical facts; after all, they are the source of practically the whole of our knowledge of the earthly life and teaching of Jesus. It is profoundly reassuring to realize that, though the historical element in the Gospels is subordinate to the religious element, it is genuine history so far as it goes. The historicity of any given section of the Gospels must of course be assessed in the light of all the available evidence; but there can be no question that the Gospels as a whole embody an authentic historical tradition. They are not histories, but they contain history.

At the same time, we do well to remember that we cannot interpret accurately the history contained in the Gospels unless we bear in mind the motives of the writers and the circumstances in which they worked. The first task of interpretation is to ask what the Gospels meant to those who wrote them and to those who read them. When we go to them for facts, we go to them for something which it was not the primary purpose of their authors to provide. We are justified in going to the Gospels to find history in biographical form, but we shall fail in proper appreciation of the history which they contain, unless we realize that it is history subordinated to a ruling motive which was not historical but religious. We have noted the deficiencies of the Gospels as historical records, but it is useless to complain of them, or to bewail the inadequacy of the material which they contain for the construction of a life or history of Jesus in the modern sense. The Gospels

* H. H. Henson, *Christian Morality*. Oxford, 1936. Lecture II. See especially pp. 46-50.

contain history, but it is history within a religious framework, and they are to be interpreted and judged in accordance with their distinctive character as religious literature. This conclusion carries with it its own corollary. The Gospels were produced by the early church in order to meet its religious needs. They grew out of the faith, conduct and worship of the primitive Christian society. Is it illegitimate to argue that a fundamental understanding of the Gospels can come only as a result of a life of religious and moral experience within the Christian community? The Gospels were written by faith for faith, and they disclose their deepest significance only to those who read them with the eye of faith.

G. J. Inglis.

CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

I must first begin by saying something about the necessity and nature of the Church. For Christianity, both the necessity and nature of the Church are grounded in the fact and character of Revelation; for the Church is The Fellowship (ἡ κοινωνία) and the whole work of creation and redemption—God's activity on and within the historical plane—is just *God's claim for fellowship*. It has been our interpretation of the doctrines of creation and redemption in mechanical or legal (transactional) terms rather than in personal terms, which has made us blind to this truth. We have been all too ready to conceive of God's relationship to the world and to history as mechanical or legal, rather than as personal. In mechanical and legal relationships the narrower logic of the Schools always holds good, and so we have produced our completely rational theologies. But in *personal* relationships this narrower logic is never adequate. In this realm a higher form of reason than logic holds sway. It was at this higher form that Anselm hinted. Though he worked in the field of rational theology in his *Cur Deus Homo*, he was not unaware, as he tells us, of the higher reasons of the spirit, and he did not really believe that,

> the embranglements
> of logic were the prime condition of all Being,
> the essence of things.

His rational theology was little else than a methodology suited to the times. All such completely rational theologies (in the narrower sense of the "rational") are sub-personal; for there is that in personality which is supra-rational. Personality is the real miracle of the universe. It is not a mathematical

entity, subject to the laws of addition and subtraction. One and one do not make two in the realm of personality. For, beyond personality is supra-personality, which is *fellowship*—the inter-penetration of personality, or the sharing of personality without its loss:

> This Individualism which is man's true Socialism.

Such an idea of *fellowship* is the guiding notion of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, and it stands in complete contradiction to all forms of pantheistic mysticism which teach the absorption of the individual in the World-soul and talk of

> A shoreless, soundless sea
> In which at last our souls must fall.

I can best illustrate my meaning here by an analogy. I would say that there is a transcending mean between the atomistic individualism of the old Liberalism and the doctrine of Totalitarian States that the State is a super-individual. Both these attitudes, it seems to me, are based on failure to understand the nature of personality, and on the confusion between "individual" and "personal." Fellowship, which is the Christian gift to the world, transcends the contradiction between the individual and the whole. It is in the nature of a higher synthesis; and, as the Christian gift to the world, it is simply the Revelation of the truth about Reality; so that the whole meaning of Creation and Redemption—of Providence—is to be found in God's claim for fellowship; for fellowship is the hidden structure of Reality.

Now, for the Christian, the ground of this assertion is witnessed to in Revelation, which is the unfolding of the hidden secret—a placarding of the fact on the plane of history—something objectively set forth. In Nature, God is not necessarily seen as personal, nor is the world seen as ordered fellowship. The secret is never wholly revealed. But in Revelation—in the Word of God in its manifoldness, first acted and spoken and finally made flesh—it is completely set forth. This difference between God as revealed in Nature and God as revealed in History—in significant action—is the whole difference between Jewish and Christian thought on the one hand, and all forms of Pantheism, non-personal mysticisms, and nature cults in the other; and it should never be forgotten when the Christian sacraments are in question. In another sense it constitutes the difference between all types of Deistic transcendence on the one hand, and Judaism and Christianity on the other. Both Judaism and Christianity see God at work in History rather than in Nature, and this means that the character of Revelation is *moral* and *spiritual*. God is

not in nature as He is in persons. Nature may be God's artistry, but man is made in the image of God, and he is made for fellowship with God. As J. Arthur Thomson said: "The universe is made of electrons, protons, radiation, and *goodness*." If this is so, what the Hebrews and Christians call Revelation is in the sphere of goodness. If this had always been remembered, we should have been spared certain doctrines of the Church and of the sacraments which have appeared in the course of history.

It is this point, that God is revealed in history, which is emphasized by St. Paul, particularly in his Roman Epistle, as it is by the writer of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The Prologue is dealing with the manifestation or shewing forth of the *character* of God on the plane of History; and it seems to me to have been definitely written to contrast the Christian way of looking at things with two others. First, there is a certain kind of Judaism which had rejected Christ and which, in this writer's scheme of things, stands for Deistic transcendence —a one-way movement—the movement from God to us. Secondly, there are certain types of Theosophy and Anthroposophy, as we should now call them, which can be characterized as "flights away from reality"—attempts to escape from the real concreteness of things and events. And these again emphasize a one-way movement—the movement from us to God—the upward-lift of all humanisms and subjectivisms. Over against these, he sets the doctrine of the Word of God, who was with God and who was God—the Word of God, who *comes* and *is received*. Here, in contrast, is a double movement, from God to us and back from us to God, involving the paradox of transcendence and immanence, but immanence of a personal and concrete type. In the Prologue, this movement from God to us and from us to God—this process, or better still, this series of crisis-acts—is set forth as finally assuming an Incarnational form. As actually given here, it is a threefold movement, deepening in intensity as it proceeds, increasing in concretion, and being made more vivid in its objectivity until it reaches a limit of concretion in the Word made Flesh. As the writer saw it, looking back into the Hebrew Scriptures, it was a process which had involved selectivity, but selectivity of a personal or apocalyptic kind. Selectivity had always involved crisis-acts, the "striking down" of God, the declaration of an "eternal now" in the midst of them. This principle of selectivity of a personal and apocalyptic kind is the ground of both Church and Sacraments. The Church was "the Israel of God" and the Christian Sacraments found their real parallel in prophetic symbolic action, which action was never

something purely didactic, but was an actualizing and realizing of the thing symbolized. Most of this symbolic action also had an eschatological element in it, but it was eschatology of the type we call realized-eschatology. And this, too, is a quality of the Christian Sacraments when we find them in the Primitive Community.

For the Jew, as for the Christian, the Word of God was never a purely verbal word. It was given in *act* rather than in phrase. It was not an ideology, not, when properly understood, a law involving a legal system of ethical and ceremonial rightness, not something marked by narrow logical consistency. It was, rather, something " full of grace and truth "—a *living* word, a compelling certainty within a given set of existents; so that our faith in it is not dependent on anything so subjective as value-judgments, but upon judgments of existence. We do not get beyond history and reach out into the eternal by regarding the historical as the insecure element in religion and seeking to build upon some necessity unrelated to the time-process, and therefore to what seems relative and evanescent. Such attempts to ignore history, which, it seems to me, were the very stuff out of which the Pagan sacramental systems were built up, can never achieve the result they set out to achieve; for they reduce us to reliance upon judgments of value as over against judgments of existence. And all such reliance is mere subjectivism—the creation of religion for ourselves. We can only reach out beyond history by giving a proper place to judgments of existence. It is, as H. G. Wood has said, when we " take history seriously that we shall find that we cannot regard religion as projection or illusion." And all this is, I think, important for the understanding of the sacramental system of Primitive Christianity.

I.

Now Christianity in its most primitive form did not begin as a system of speculative thought or as a reasoned theology. It began as a Way of Worship and of Life, based upon a Faith. And Faith was not assent to certain intellectual propositions enshrining a metaphysic about reality or a cosmological phantasia. Faith, for the early Church, seems to have been trust in and loyalty to the Person of Christ Jesus. And dogma was not a given set of propositions to be believed on pain of death, but a set of *given facts* which had happened in history. These facts were regarded by early Christians as having a certain meaning and value for life. To put it simply, they were regarded as being, in an absolute sense, acts of God on

the plane of history. The earliest compilation of these facts of which we have any record is that given by St. Paul writing to the Corinthian Church about A.D. 53. He there assures the Corinthians that he delivered unto them *first of all* that which he had received, evidently referring, as Eduard Meyer has claimed, to the instruction given him by the messenger of the Damascus Church before his Baptism, perhaps some fifteen years earlier. These facts were:

1. Christ Jesus died for our sins according to the Scriptures.
2. He was buried.
3. He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.
4. He was seen of Cephas.

Here, then, we have four given events in history, and Faith, for the early Christian, meant relying on these events as the redemptive acts of God—just as God had once created, He had now come to redeem. From this followed, in the early community, the exaltation of Jesus as Lord (*Maran*) and the beginning of Christian Worship, centring in two Redemption Rites, which were dramatic, symbolic acts, setting forth and actualizing the Holy Action of God within history, which action revealed His *character* to be *righteous love*. When we first meet the Christian Church, Faith is a simple matter of trust in, and loyalty to, the manifestation of the character of God as set forth in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For them this faith was sealed by such simple affirmation as, "I believe that Jesus is Lord" or "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God," which were oaths of allegiance rather than dogmatic utterances in the sense in which we now generally understand "dogma." In their worship, which was corporate *action* rather than *words*, they constantly saw the Holy Action of God represented in symbolic forms. In Baptism they saw set forth the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, and the personal action of God was again made intimate and actualized in the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. In the Eucharist, to use St. Paul's striking phrase, they again saw Christ "visibly depicted crucified" in the Fraction of the Bread, and His Holy Action was made significant and powerful in the Fellowship which shared His life and was willing to be identified with Him in treading the path of love and in witnessing (martyrdom).

II.

All this, in its essence, which is essentially Hebrew in character, moral and personal, and not theosophic, is not different from the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments

which we find in St. Paul. In his doctrine of the Church St. Paul gives it more coherent expression, but he does not depart from personal and moral ideas. It is no mere figure of speech when he calls the Church "the Body of Christ." He is speaking of something real. The Church is that concrete reality by which Christ becomes manifest in the world, and by which He acts in history. And he goes even further when, more than once, he suggests that "the Christ" is not simply the historic Jesus, nor even the glorified Christ, but the glorified Christ *plus* the Church. It is this daring *identification* of the Christ and the Church which underlies his discourse on Christian marriage in Ephesians—"we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." And it underlies, too, his amazing statement in Colossians: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which was lacking of the afflictions of Christ, in my flesh, for His body's sake, which is the Church." Here he is speaking of an experience of fellowship so real and so close that it involves that interpenetration of personality which is the hidden secret of reality. Already in 1 Cor. xii. it would appear that Christ and the Church are completely identified, and this is further illustrated in his doctrine of Baptism and of the Eucharist.

Now this is not the theologizing of St. Paul, borrowed from Pagan sources; for, in the first place, its personal and eschatological character differs from what we know of either Greek or Oriental influences surrounding the Church; and, in the second place, it is implicit in all the shewing of God in the Old Testament from the time that Abraham went forth not knowing whither he went. We catch the authentic accents of it in the words about "the Suffering Servant of Yahweh" and "the Son of Man." We see it in the action of Jesus in choosing the Apostles "to be with Him," and we see it in the primitive pre-Pauline Church which, it would appear, in spite of its belief in the immediate coming of Jesus again, regarded His earthly life as only the *beginning* of His *doing* and teaching.

According to this conception, the Church differs from every other society in the world. It is not of human contriving—it is divine. It represents that point in the creative and redemptive activity of God where He is revealed, and as such it is a projection into the future of that shewing forth of Himself which was begun when "the Word was in the world, and the world knew Him not." It is a supernatural society within a natural environment—"a colony of heaven," as St. Paul called it.

More particularly, the Church can be regarded as the perpetuation of the Incarnation, having about it those para-

doxical qualities in duality which the Lord had. Like Him, it was conceived of as both human and divine; as temporal and yet eternal; as in the world and yet not of it; as local and yet universal; as weak and yet all-powerful; as fallible and yet infallible. Many Catholics have erred in this respect in asserting that General Councils do not err, and in framing a rigid, logical and mechanical theory of infallibility. But Protestants have equally erred in denying the infallibility of the Church. The Church is both fallible and infallible. It is this " either-or " policy which has prevented much true understanding of the Church and, indeed, of reality. Where there is concretion and process there must be this paradoxical duality. It is the characteristic of all living-ness. The Church is the " carrier of possibilities " which in her become *actualized*, so that her rectitude is invested with infinite importance. It is in crisis-acts that the Church is seen most clearly to be infallible, that an " eternal now " is given in the movement of time; so that infallibility is to be looked for in its religious (apocalyptic) attitudes and ethical temper, rather than in traditional and mystical forms. There are times, in this sphere, when the Church utters a sure Word of God; but in keeping with what we have said about the genius of Hebrew and Christian religious ideas, it is an *acted* word rather than a *spoken* word.

III.

Both in the primitive pre-Pauline Christianity and in Pauline Christianity this conception of the Church is closely related to sacramental doctrine and practice. The key-notions lying behind sacramental theory and practice are " personal," " ethical " and " concrete," as over against " mechanical," " legal," " abstract and mystical." In the sacraments, rather than in creeds, at first, the Faith (in the sense in which I have earlier described it) was preserved and dramatically set forth. In Baptism and in the Eucharist, Christians saw the Crucifixion, the Death, Burial and Resurrection of their Lord repeating themselves in the life and profession of disciples, and proclaiming to the ages that He who was to come is come (the eschatological note). Christianity was the Good News about God's action as Holy Energy, *personally* directed and morally conditioned. Such Holy Energy acting in the field of human experience was bound to work sacramentally, allowing for what was objective (God's part) and for what was subjective (man's response). So far as objectivity was concerned, the work of sacramental grace could not be left to depend upon man's psychological condition, for this might leave him in a perpetual state of doubt

as to whether God had acted at all. Rather it depended upon the fact and nature of God's Holy Action, which is an eternal reality, but which is set forth in the historical plane in the life and death of Jesus Christ, God's personal response to our need. And this Holy Action was perpetuated and actualized in the dramatic symbolism of the sacraments. So far as subjectivity was concerned, it was sufficiently guaranteed by faith and penitence in the disciples, which constituted the moral response to the *given* thing. It was the *Real Action* of God in the sacraments which was central in early Christian thought, rather than the *Real Presence.*

Finally, in primitive Christianity the sacraments had no meaning apart from the notion of the corporate society in its attitude of worship. They were corporate, not individual acts; but corporate in the sense of *fellowship,* and not in the sense of mass-controlled actions or mass-delegated actions. The worshippers were in and with the action; and worship was fellowship—fellowship between God and man as between man and man, the place where the earthly and the heavenly planes met in sacramental action. Even in its primitive form the Eucharist, which had its origin not only in the crisis-experience of the Last Supper but in the daily fellowship meals which Jesus had shared with His intimate followers, which themselves were of an eschatological character, appears to have been a great Churchly service, in which the Church as a royal priesthood offered worship, but not of a pattern of her own designing nor one determined by her own preferences. Rather, she offered worship through her great High Priest, who was there set forth in His Holy Redeeming Act as *sacrificium.* Upon this sacrifice the Church spiritually fed in communion, which was God's giving and their receiving, something essentially personal. The emphasis was on the objective side. It was that which had divine character which was being done, that which had significance for eternal reality; and whilst faith was necessary for obedience in such a truly personal relationship (an emphasis which has been weakened where legal and metaphysical notions have been substituted for personal conceptions), yet the value of what was done did not depend upon anything so fluctuating as the psychic states of the worshippers—it was not primarily to be measured by " spiritual uplift." It would appear that the early Christians—in line with Jewish thought generally—were quite clear that there must be divine action on and within the historical plane, and that both *events* and *things* had significance for such action. But it would also appear that they safeguarded themselves against superstition and against reducing divine action to

the level of the sub-personal, because things were for them significant only as they were within the realm of action. But within that realm of action they *were* significant, not in the sense that they acted as memory quickeners, but in the sense that the whole action effected and actualized what it symbolized. We can best describe it as a kind of realized eschatology. Past, present and future were gathered together as it were at a single point. Thus the believer experienced everything that Christ experienced; he suffered with Him, he was crucified with Him, he died with Him, he was buried with Him and he rose with Him. It was co-experiencing, not post-experiencing. In such a moment the conflict might still be going on as a time-process, but the victory was already won as an eternal reality and *actually realized.*

W. Robinson.

BISHOP BERKELEY'S FAMILY: AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HIGH CHURCH CONVERSATION PIECE

Time has dealt kindly but not altogether fairly by Eliza Berkeley, wife of a one-time Vicar of Bray who became a Prebendary of Canterbury, and daughter-in-law of the Philosopher-Bishop of Cloyne. She has escaped inclusion in Miss Edith Sitwell's calendar, *The English Eccentrics*, and a merciful oblivion has preserved her from the psychoanalytic writers of the present age, who, not without excuse, might have hailed her book as a first-rate example of the idiosyncrasies of maternal affection. Yet this oblivion, and even more the impatient criticisms passed upon her book by such eminent scholars as Professor Campbell Fraser—who scanned her pages for information about Bishop Berkeley—and Dr. Birkbeck Hill—who searched them for details relating to St. Andrews within a decade after Dr. Johnson's tour—have created a prejudice against the writer, which has resulted in students of both literary and social history neglecting an intimate and strikingly individual picture of English life in the last forty years of the Eighteenth Century as lived by a wealthy and well-bred clerical family, whose learning and piety were the twofold inheritance of Non-Juring and High Church tradition.

It is true that in several respects Mrs. Berkeley's book—a beautiful specimen of the printer's craft, published by Nichols as a large quarto in 1797, and consisting ostensibly of *Poems by the late George-Monck Berkeley, Esq., LL.B., F.S.S.A.*—is

a curious compilation, and reflects the undoubted eccentricity of the "editor." To a small collection of occasionally charming but by no means remarkable verse, which occupies 178 pages, not only was there added "The Editor's Postcript" of 33 pages, which would have completed a slim volume, its pages made easy for reference by the use of Arabic numerals; but there was assembled a "Preface," a "Postcript," a letter "To Corresponding Friends" and "The Editor's Reply," all in the way of prefatory matter, and printed on more than 600 pages awkwardly distinguished by Roman numerals. A book so constructed, without index, containing numerous repetitions, lengthy digressions, and frequently absurd footnotes on trifling and extremely personal matters, and one which, apart from a small kernel of poetry, consisted of a mother's memoir of her son, might well be suspect. Nor is it to be wondered at that on its publication a reviewer in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (lxvii., pp. 405-6), in spite of the indulgence for "the partiality of a Mother" which the "editor" had craved, made a passing reference to "the *garrula senectus* of Maternal Piety."

Other references to the book in the same quarter show that on its first appearance it evoked both interest and criticism. The late eighteenth century was not lacking in, and had even a distinct partiality for, descriptions of *la vie intime*. But such studies were predominantly psychological in character. Moreover, by introducing the reader to the spiritual, though not necessarily religious, biographies of individuals, they extended the range, as they varied the methods, of earlier books of devotion, and made possible for him a similar, and often purely secular, spiritual and intellectual adjustment. Mrs. Berkeley's book is objective throughout. She tells us about herself and her opinions, and gives specimens of her conduct, but she tells all these things much as another might relate them; so that, if reduced to reasonable compass, her account of herself would bear a strong resemblance to one of Law's "characters." Like Eusebia in *A Serious Call*, she would have thought it "hard not to know the family into which" one was "born, or what ancestors" one was "descended from"; but, also like Eusebia, she was ready to counsel her children to "be glad . . . to know the wants of the poorest people, and let your hands be employed in making such mean and ordinary things for them as their necessities require"; since "the humility . . . of this employment will be as beneficial to you as the duty of it. It will keep you from all vain and proud thoughts of your own state and distinction in life, and from treating the poor as creatures of a different species." But, whatever else she is garrulous about, Mrs. Berkeley

never lifts the veil on the inner communion of her soul with God. The unusually personal trifles to which she refers serve in a way as figures on an iconostasis which distract our attention from what is transpiring in the privacy beyond.

It is this note of old-fashioned High Church piety which gives her book one of its perennial interests, for *conversation pieces* which revivify the life coloured by this piety are rare. Evelyn's portrait of Margaret Godolphin, like Cosin's *Devotions*, illustrates a different moment and temper in English religion. Wesley's *Journal* marks the transition to new interests and methods. Woolman's *Journal* reflects the peculiar sensitiveness of one separated from the larger activities, cultural and other, of his time. Newton's *Cardiphonia*, like the *Olney Hymns* which flowed from his own and Cowper's pens, excites a warmth of emotion which is entirely different. In some respects Doddridge's *Rise and Progress* insists most nearly on the sober and disciplined life which was characteristic of the High Churchmen. Yet there is noticeable a subtle distinction, not unconnected with an absence of cheerfulness in Doddridge; and it is because of the great difficulty of supplying concrete illustrations to such distinctions that Mrs. Berkeley's account of the life of her family and of her education of her son assumes importance. If she was the pupil of any master, Law's *Serious Call* and *The Way to Divine Knowledge* were her manuals. In the works of the religious layman, Soame Jenyns, she found either inspiration or confirmation of her attitude to life.

The High Church tradition in family and social life is not easy to explicate. It lacks the high lights, the thrilling passion, or the unruffled quietism of other Christian confessions. It resembles an engraving set amid paintings: a Rembrandt amid Botticellis and Pre-Raphaelites. Yet its subjects are ever the same—the Nativity, Crucifixion and Resurrection, the Charge to St. Peter, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Parable of the Last Judgement. To the men and women who lived by it these examples were constantly present, giving purpose and significance to their lives.

It is this life Mrs. Berkeley reports.

II

Eliza Frinsham was the elder daughter of the Reverend Henry Frinsham, Vicar of White Waltham in Windsor Forest, whose father-in-law was Francis Cherry, Esq., of Shottesbrook House, Berkshire, a staunch Jacobite, a great antiquary, and a friend of " the seraphic Bishop Kenn," who made Shottesbrook House " a second home " whenever he wished to leave the

Marquis of Bath's residence at Longleat. Ken, Mrs. Berkeley describes as being of a merry and cheerful disposition; and she relates that he " every morning made a vow that he would not marry *that* day." Francis Cherry's loyalty to the Stuarts and devotion to the Church of England had been demonstrated by his sending Charles Leslie, at his own expense, to endeavour the conversion of the Old Pretender, his Jacobitism more spectacularly and perhaps less piously during a stag-hunt, by his riding, followed by William of Orange, at all the most dangerous fences, in the hope that the " usurper " might be " thrown " and killed. When Queen Anne was prayed for in church he stood up, while his friend Dodwell slid off his knees and sank upon his hassock. According to his granddaughter, he bequeathed a box of " very curious old genuine manuscripts to the Bodleian," including " a small manuscript book, written entirely by Queen Elizabeth, the cover of pale blue cloth embroidered with gold and silver leaves and flowers by her *royal fingers*." He died in 1714, otherwise, Mrs. Berkeley assures us, he would have been *out* in " The Fifteen."

Francis Cherry's wife had been one of the five daughters and co-heiresses of John Finch of Fiennes Court—also in Berkshire. To this gentleman a Cavalier memory adhered: it was in his clothes that " King Charles escaped." Presumably this refers to Charles II. after the Battle of Worcester; but Mrs. Berkeley gives no particulars. From both Francis Cherry and his wife, Mrs. Frinsham, and ultimately Mrs. Berkeley and her only sister, Anne, inherited a considerable fortune. This was in 1753 when Eliza Frinsham was in her twentieth year. In 1761 she was married to the Reverend George Berkeley, son of the philosopher, and two years later her elder son, George Monck, was born at Bray, of which parish his father was then Vicar. The boy's second Christian name commemorated the relationship of his paternal grandmother, the Bishop's widow, with the Cromwellian General of that name. Through the Bishop the child was nearly related to General Wolfe, the Hero of Quebec, and to Archbishop Usher.

In 1768 the Vicar of Bray received the degree of LL.D., and hence is usually referred to as Dr. George Berkeley. He exchanged Bray for Cookham, and was, successively, Rector of St. Clement Danes, of Acton in Middlesex and of Ticehurst in Sussex, and Chancellor of Brecknock. In 1771 he received his Prebend's stall and the family removed to Canterbury. While the Berkeleys were still residing at Bray, a second son, George Robert, and two daughters were born. The latter died in infancy, and George Robert, in 1775, at the age of nine. George Monck, who lived to be thirty years of age, and

the posthumous publication of whose poems occasioned his mother's experiments in biography and autobiography, was, therefore, for the first twelve years of his life not an only son. His father, moreover, who, like all Bishop Berkeley's children, had been educated privately, insisted on his being sent to a Public School. Accordingly, after attending with his brother King's School, Canterbury, Monck (as he was familiarly called) was sent to Eton, which he left at the age of sixteen to read for two years with his father. For three and a half years from 1781 he was a student at St. Andrews University, to which Dr. Berkeley, like his wife a keen student of Spanish—she always carried "a Spanish Prayer Book" to church—was attracted by the presence there of Principal Watson, whose *History of Philip II. of Spain*, published in 1777, had in the opinion of his contemporaries elevated him to the first rank of historians, where he took second place only to the great Robertson.

It is in connection with Monck Berkeley's residence at St. Andrews that the strangest part of the family history is concerned—the description of what Mrs. Berkeley always refers to as "our *Séjour* in Scotland."* His parents and his aunt, Miss Frinsham—who for over forty-four years was never separated from Mrs. Berkeley—accompanied the young man, with, in addition, several trusty servants. The party were given cordial hospitality *en route*, in spite of Mrs. Berkeley's inconvenient habit of stopping to inspect any gentleman's residence she desired to see. If in England they owed their favourable reception to their equipage and evident gentility, in Scotland they received no less attention as the near relatives of a philosopher. Indeed, the courtesies they received in the latter country form a curious commentary on the social history of the times. The whole family was treated with incredible respect, and Monck quickly became a *lion* among the county families. Although a mere youth he was given the freedom of Aberdeen, and, according to his mother's narrative, of several other northern towns which she does not specify. Such attentions require explanation, and such is probably to be discovered in the Episcopalian attachments of the people of the north-east. Bishop Skinner, who later as Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, was successful in securing the removal of the penal restrictions under which Scottish Episcopalians then suffered, was on one occasion young

* I have given an account of the Berkeleys' residence in Scotland in an article entitled "Bishop Berkeley's Grandson: His *Séjour* in Scotland and Literary Associates," published in *the University of Edinburgh Journal*, Autumn Number, 1935, pp. 220 *seq.*

Berkeley's host in Aberdeen. That Dr. Berkeley assisted the Scots Bishops in their attempt to have these restrictions removed is also known. Honours paid to the son, therefore, may well have been intended to compliment the father.

Monck Berkeley's subsequent career was undistinguished, although he appears to have taken a real interest in historical studies, and, in 1789, published a volume of *Literary Relics*, containing hitherto unpublished letters of Charles II., the Queen of Bohemia, and several literary men. He paid a visit to Dublin, showed himself an ardent defender of Swift's reputation, and (also in 1789) took the degree of LL.B. from Trinity College. (The F.S.S.A. of his mother's title-page—*F.S.A. Scots* as we should now write it—was one of his Scots "honours.") For a time he lived in France. For a time he was a Sceptic. Sin of a gross character is hinted at, but, not unnaturally, left unexplained. Finally, having become a convinced and humble Christian, but in failing health, he returned to Canterbury, where he died in 1793.

Dr. Berkeley died two years later, and Miss Frinsham in 1797, shortly before the publication of Mrs. Berkeley's book. Mrs. Berkeley survived in loneliness, partial blindness, and either actually or relatively reduced circumstances until 1800.

Necessary as are these particulars to "place" the chief actors in the little drama which Eliza Berkeley presents, it is in her observations upon contemporary life and her account of the early education of her son, rather than in detailed references to his later—and uneventful—career, that the chief interest of her narrative consists.

III

By her own confession few women could have been less fitted for motherhood. "Mrs. Berkeley," she writes, "does not love little children. . . . She *pities* the poor little pewling disagreeable animals. A kitten can divert one; but the *untaught* offspring of the Lord of creation cannot. So much for the *Dignity* of *fallen* Human Nature!"

Puppies and kittens further recommended themselves in her eyes as possible articles of diet, the great fecundity of dogs and cats making it "reasonable to suppose that the bounteous Giver of every good gift meant these cheaply fed domestic animals for food for man." Moreover, she adds slily: "It is well known that half London who choose to eat *tame* rabbits, certainly eat cats." The prejudice against eating domestic animals, she considered, was one, "which, perhaps, like *most* other prejudices, it would be wisdom to give up."

For the first offices of motherhood she prepared herself by reading the *Essay on the Nursing of Children* by Dr. William Cadogan, Physician to the Foundling Hospital, a book which "exploded" "the deposition of infants in cradles." Monck Berkeley, therefore, was placed in a large easy chair during the day. But "Mrs. Berkeley's first care for her children was the education of their souls"; and while what she tells us of her reflections when she first "perceived" that God "was about to entrust her with the care of an immortal soul," and of her persistent prayers for her children's salvation, is in no way unique in the annals of pious women, these considerations undoubtedly colour her subsequent attitude to her son.

Her remarks on this topic lead to a footnote in which reference is made to a letter which she had contributed to *The St. James's Chronicle*, in the course of which she had combated "Dr. Beattie's idea of not permitting children to hear that there is a Supreme Being until they attain the age of six years." The statement referred to occurs in another memoir of a gifted son, *Essays and Fragments in Prose and Verse by James Hay Beattie*, to which his *Minstrel* father had prefixed "An Account of the Author's Life and Character." Beattie's views on the topic under discussion were those familiar to students of Comenius and Rousseau, fortified by his own experience "that to be made to repeat words not understood is extremely detrimental to the faculties of a young mind" (*op. cit.*, p. 11). In the very spirit of Rousseau, he relates how he wrote in the soil with his finger "the three initial letters" of his son's name; "and, sowing garden cresses in the furrows, covered up the seed, and smoothed the ground." The appearance of the tiny crop led to a conversation in the course of which Beattie was able to present to his son—then in his sixth year—the outlines of the celebrated *Argument from Design* (*ibid.*, pp. 11-13).

At the present day the religiously minded will agree with Mrs. Berkeley's criticism of Beattie's attitude. The psychologically minded will probably applaud it. Mrs. Berkeley, however, who was an intimate friend and enthusiastic admirer of Lord Monboddo—who, fortunately for her good opinion of him, had published nothing on the religious and moral training of Youth—seems to have felt a decided aversion to contemporary Scots works on Education. A publication of Lord Kames' extreme old age, which appeared in 1781 when his lordship was in his eighty-fifth year, entitled *Loose Hints upon Education, chiefly concerning the Culture of the Heart*, called forth her lively disapproval. That she should have concerned herself so much about the productions of Scots

writers may at first excite astonishment; but it is to be remembered that from 1772, when he published his *Essay on Truth*, Beattie had been paid extravagant attentions as the vindicator of Christianity against the sceptic Hume, and Kames enjoyed a high literary reputation. Mrs. Berkeley, therefore, had every reason to fear their influence in spreading opinions of which she disapproved.

Monck Berkeley and his brother were probably not unhappy little boys in an age when parents were hedged about with a formality that has long since been abandoned. They knelt, morning and evening, to receive their parents' blessing, but on one knee only, according to the prescription of Mrs. Berkeley's father. Two knees were for God alone. Their mother always told them " that as soon as ever they entered their *teens*, the words *Papa* and *Mamma* were to be laid aside for *my Father* and *Mother* when speaking *of* their parents—*Sir* and *Madam*, as usual, when speaking *to* them." According to his biographer Monck continued to observe the latter injunction most punctiliously. It was his mother's custom to visit her boys' rooms at night " to see whether they lay straight, and in a wholesome position, which is of more consequence to children than people in general are aware of." On one such occasion she found Monck awake, who explained: " I have been *racking* my brain to try to make a syllable without a vowel, because you have always told me it was impossible to do it."

Mrs. Berkeley tells us that she was severe with her children and indulgent with her servants, but that she always had her way with both by insisting quietly but firmly that what she desired was to be done, and not by " shewing authority." Although she resorted to starving as a punishment for her sons, it was a modified form of starvation, as she always gave them potatoes and water, since " it injures children's stomachs to fast entirely, or to go to bed supperless." Nothing perhaps separates her more from the outlook of the present age than her remarks upon the virtue of home-brewed beer. The good health enjoyed by the boys of King's School, Canterbury, during the headmastership of Gurney she attributes, " under God," to their drinking such beer. For herself, at one time she had enjoyed a cup of tea " in pleasant company." With the loss of her loved ones this pleasure no longer remained, and she describes herself as " *a poor old fashioned creature*, who does not like that solace at half-past seven or eight; she not being able to sleep without a small quantity of malt-liquor, a most excellent safe narcotic; so much so, that, for very many years, she never took it at night, as it prevented her rising at five in the morning—when she was young to improve her own

mind, afterwards to attend to her children's. . . ." She adds: "The Editor rejoices that her spirit is not as wilful as her sadly weakened stomach, which suffers direfully, if it does not get the *very small* dinner it will receive at three, . . . according to the *vulgar* hours in use forty years ago."

Here, indeed, we have the manners of a past age! In her love of gardens, however, Mrs. Berkeley looks forward to our own. She was "a great gardener, and made her children such." Until they went to King's School, Canterbury, she undertook their education, and there seems every reason to suppose that in Monck, at least, she had a precocious pupil. If we are inclined to demur at her statement that "Before six years old he could spell any word in the English language without book, and before he had completed his eighth year, knew how to introduce them with propriety when occasion served," Sir John Temple's remark sounds probable, that "at near sixteen" his nephew was a pretty good Latin and Greek scholar but could not express himself so well in English as Monck Berkeley. The pronouncement of that eighteenth-century paragon, Lord Lyttelton, as recorded by Mrs. Berkeley, that Monck "had the *strongest* as well as the *most brilliant* powers of mind he had ever seen" was an enviable tribute, though it may have had strict reference to the boy's age, which did not exceed ten at the time of Lord Lyttelton's death.

From both parents Monck Berkeley inherited an intense family pride. It was his mother's opinion that "A man, that is descended from a King rather than from a Cobler, from a Hero rather than from a Huckster, may feel grateful to his Maker." But if she believed in a proper pride she was equally determined to teach her son a proper humility. When the family removed from Bray to Acton, their new residence, unlike their old, had two sets of stairs, one of these being for the use of the servants. Monck refused to use the latter. "An order was immediately made, and strictly adhered to, that he was not, for a *whole* week (a long time for a creature of three feet high), to presume, in the day time, to go up or down the great stair-case to the dressing-room, to his Mamma, to read or play."

As further training in how they should treat their fellow-creatures—and this, surely, is the very accent of Law's Eusebia —"Mr. Berkeley and his brother were, whilst children, always made, not to touch, but to take off their hats to the poorest labourer in the village who saluted them; if ever they saw an old man or woman with a burden of wood, or leazed [*i.e.*, gleaned] corn, to run to open the gate to let them through." In the same spirit the little boys were not allowed to issue

orders to the servants. These, they were told, were not *their* servants, but their father's, and they must preface their requests with " Pray." The passage is a significant one, because, unlike Law, Mrs. Berkeley is not indicating an ideal but relating how persons in her station, holding the religious views she did, brought up their children. The manners inculcated are not those of the fashionable world of their time, as witness Fielding's novels. Nor were they the manners which prevailed in, and are still too often imitated from, Victorian England. They are manners grounded in the Christian view of life.

If at first sight Mrs. Berkeley's habit of reading the Bible—" an old thumbed Bible, for the powder and pomatum would spoil a good one "—while her maid was dressing her hair seems to us irreverent, the habit was of long standing. The Reverend John Livingstone (1603-72), in the *Memorable Characteristics* appended to his autobiography, relates the same of Dame Lilias Graham, Countess of Wigtown, one of the saintly ladies of Covenanting times (*Select Biographies*, Wodrow Society, 1845, p. 339). And Mrs. Berkeley not only read, but read aloud and explained as she read, or rather, when she was " requested to lay down the book, because while the frizzing " was being attended to the reading could not go on. But her religious exposition did !

This is not mere eccentricity. Far less is it proof of madness. If Professor Campbell Fraser and Dr. Birkbeck Hill regarded it as such they were clearly mistaken. Neither should we detect fanaticism in the promise which Mrs. Berkeley exacted from her son that he would never " when arguing . . . to improve in logic . . . undertake the *wrong* side of the question." Her advice may have been bad, but it was dictated by her intense regard for truth. Her self-reported meddling with the incidents in his one novel, the *Spanish Memoirs*—a disguised account of some of their friends—is less justifiable. Yet, here again, her claim was that even a work of fiction should promote God's glory by ministering to cheerfulness; and her son had proposed to introduce a tragic incident.

It is right that we should close on the note of cheerfulness —the note that Eliza Berkeley records as characteristic of Ken. Her book, though a disorderly one, is not a dull one. Neither is it a sanctimonious one. The life it depicts is that of cultured people, fully alive to the advantages of their birth and station, and given to hospitality, so much so, that their house at Canterbury could be referred to in jest as " The Berkeley Arms." For them intellectual conversation took the place of cards, " the Concert " that of the theatre. They used their horses for hunting but not for racing. Their pleasures were

normal but selected with discrimination. Hence, the kaleidoscope which Mrs. Berkeley presents differs fundamentally from the toys which amused others. It was set in motion by God, and those who gazed at the swiftly changing formations recognized them for what they were—the fleeting, variable "goods" of Time, which were to be enjoyed but not retained, and whose real significance lay in their power of stimulating deeper and more spiritual emotions, by the exercise of which alone a man can be brought *en rapport* with his Maker and receive the guarantee of eternal life.

W. Fraser Mitchell.

MISCELLANEA

FR. JOHN EVANGELIST, O.M.CAP., AND THE SPANISH MYSTICS

In the Foreword to the edition of *The Kingdom of the Soul* by Fr. John Evangelist of Bois-le-Duc in the Netherlands, edited by the Benedictine nuns of Stanbrook (Capuchin Classics. Sheed and Ward, 1930), citation is made of several writers to whom the author of this work was possibly indebted. It may be noted further that he employs two illustrative similes which in all probability were borrowed from the works of St. John of the Cross and of St. Teresa. On p. 65 of his treatise we find this saying: "For if a bird be tied fast to the ground or to a bough it is all one whether it be fastened by a cord or a thread; in any case it cannot rise into the air. So it is with the soul of man, which is created to live in God as the bird in the air, but is hindered in its heavenward flight by attachment to creatures, be that attachment never so slight." The parallel passage by St. John of the Cross in *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* (Bk. I., chap. xi., 4) reads thus: "For it seems to me that a bird is fastened by a slender thread like as by a heavier one; since, although it be slender, the bird is as well held by it as by the heavier, until it be broken so that he can fly. It is true that it is easier to break the slender thread; nevertheless, so long as it is not broken, the bird cannot fly. And thus it is with a soul that has attachment to anything; however much virtue it may possess, it cannot attain to the liberty of divine union."

On p. 109 of the same volume Fr. John Evangelist says: "For our understanding and other faculties, like a mill, are always turning and working; and, as flowing water, are always running outwards." In her *Interior Castle* (IV., i., 12), in reference to distractions that distress the soul, St. Teresa writes: "Let the mill clack on, while we grind our wheat; that is, let us continue to work with our will and intellect." This illustration she herself probably took from the *Third Spiritual Alphabet* by Francisco de Osuna (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1931), with which we know her to have been familiar. He speaks of the necessity of "ridding ourselves of the imaginations and distractions which proceed from the sensitive nature, the noises which stupefy the soul, like the ceaseless grinding of a mill" (p. 50). This simile of the mill can be traced back to the *Conferences* of Cassian. In the first Conference of Abbot Moses (chap. xviii.) occurs the following passage: "And this movement of the heart is not unsuitably illustrated by the comparison of a mill-wheel, which the headlong rush of water whirls round, with revolving impetus, and which can never stop its work so long as it is driven round by the action of the water: but it is in the power of the man who directs it, to decide whether he will have wheat or barley or darnel ground by it. That certainly must be crushed by it which is put into it by the man who has charge of that business. So then the mind also through the trials of the present life is driven about by the torrents of temptations pouring in upon it from all sides, and cannot be free from the flow of thoughts: but the character of the thoughts which it should either throw off or admit for itself, it will provide by the efforts of its own earnestness and diligence" (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XI., p. 303).

The connection of Fr. John Evangelist's thought with that of St. John of the Cross and of St. Teresa, or of de Osuna, is more evident than his possible dependence upon Cassian, although his quotations shew him to have been familiar with early Latin writers. The intercourse in his time between Spain and the Low Countries, where he lived, was close and frequent. The *Kingdom of God in the Soul* was certainly not written before 1620, the date at which he was appointed novice-master. St. Teresa's *Interior Castle* had been previously published at Salamanca in 1588, and the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* was first printed in 1619. Some MSS. of the writings of St. John of the Cross are known to have been in the possession of Anne of Jesus, an intimate friend of St. Teresa, who founded a Carmelite convent in Brussels in 1607. In more ways than one the works of the Spanish mystics may have come into the hands of Fr. John Evangelist.

Mother Mary Maude, C.S.M.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS AT EDINBURGH

In the most interesting article of Fr. Bévenot, S.J., "Some Fundamentals at Edinburgh," one or two points seem to call for comment.

"The Mass is not a new sacrifice in the sense of being independent of the one great Sacrifice. . . . The Mass brings Calvary into our Churches, spanning the centuries as the wireless spans the seas." The illustration of wireless is unfortunate (though it seems so effective on first reading), because a programme has to be performed at headquarters each time it is received by a set. This is just what the Reformers objected to. Christ offered Himself *once* on the historical Calvary. Further, the Church of Rome teaches that each Mass is itself an effective sacrifice. This is as if each wireless set could itself produce a programme. Christ never gave His Church power to repeat Calvary, or to offer Him anew; He only gave it a rite whereby to commemorate His own self-offering on Calvary.

Fr. Bévenot discusses comprehensiveness, compromise and capitulation as principles upon which Church union might be based. He declares the first would leave things as they are; he rejects the second and he advocates the third. But capitulation is as impossible as compromise to a conscientious mind. Besides, I doubt if any of the Churches represented at Edinburgh would consider themselves in a position to accept capitulation from the other Churches. Each was too conscious of virtues present in other Churches to make this demand of them. I think Fr. Bévenot does not appreciate the spiritual possibilities of comprehensiveness. With the removal of a spirit of antagonism, the various Churches would grow into a fellowship which would be a true unity in spite of the preservation of their several characteristics.

In conclusion may I thank Fr. Bévenot for such a stimulating article —one which really brought out the meaning of various ideas.

W. C. G. Proctor.

Harold's Cross Rectory,
Dublin.

"OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST" AND THOMAS À KEMPIS

"THE voice of books is indeed one, but it instructs not all alike," so the author of this book tells us. And the words of the fifteenth-century monk have reached to the ends of the earth, commanding a wider audience than any, before or since, save the words of Scripture. Yet since Thomas à Kempis treats of that twofold science, the knowledge of God and of a man's own heart, his message is individual, separate, and each of us reads and learns according to his capacity and desire.

Of the Imitation of Christ (or *Following* as some early versions render it) has been translated into almost every language, and its different editions run into thousands. It is one of the timeless classics, and has held its place, assured and unchallenged, since the first completed copies went forth, about the year 1425, from the Monastery of the Canons Regular at Mount St. Agnes, beside Zwolle, just east of the Zuider Zee. The book was already known in England and other lands when printing provided the means for a wider and more rapid circulation.

Yet not one of the many commentators has quite discovered the secret of its popularity. Much of the subject-matter is common to all those masters of the spiritual life who write of what they know, though few have conveyed so clear a sense of first-hand, personal experience, and in none perhaps has this been combined with such wealth of exact expression and happy distinction of style.

But affection, whether for persons or books, defies analysis, and it may be we love the *Imitation* chiefly because the writer, during the years of his writing, grows himself entirely lovable, and the venture he bids us share is that of his own laborious life, a life "hid," indeed, "with Christ in God," yet evident through every line he penned. As we read and ponder these four short books we catch some glimpse of final human perfection, of the full out-shining of light we each in our measure possess, "the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Nor does the radiance blind or dishearten us, for we are shewn, step by step, the efforts, struggles, defeats which attend the path of the saint even more closely, it seems, than that of the ordinary traveller. Moreover, we slowly perceive combats and consolations to be but incidents in that journey to God which à Kempis sets forth. These he describes in detail—the tribulations by which we enter the Kingdom, the hints of its glory—but his eyes are fixed on the King, in whose intimate presence the self with its virtues and failures will one day be wholly forgotten.

But à Kempis admits quite simply, "I am wont to be subject to many distractions," and reminds himself and his reader: "Thou desirest to be filled with the highest good but thou canst not attain it yet."

Of outward events in the life of Thomas à Kempis the record is scanty, since, except for quite a short interruption, at least seventy of his ninety odd years were spent within the walls of one monastery, the house of the Canons Regular at Mount St. Agnes.

Thomas was born at Kempen, a small town in what we now call Rhenish Prussia, about the year 1380. He died on July 25, 1471. From his school-days onward he was commonly known not by his father's surname but as Thomas of Kempen—Thomas à Kempis. His parents, John and Gertrude Haemmerlein (or Haemerken), were peasants. We are told that his father was a worker in metal—as in fact his name suggests

—and his mother the Dame of a school for small children in Kempen. There were two sons, John, the elder by some fifteen years, and Thomas. It is likely the parents were pious and intelligent, for John left his home for the famous Dutch school at Deventer where, later, Erasmus was educated. He probably went before his brother was born, later joining himself to "The Brotherhood of the Common Life" in that town. To the school at Deventer went Thomas himself at the age of twelve or thirteen. He sought out his brother and was by him placed in the care of Florentius Radewyn, who was the Head of the Brotherhood and also Parish Priest of Deventer. At first the boy did not live with the Brothers, but in a safe lodging. Florentius shewed himself a true patron, watching over his education and giving him fatherly care. He was a man of most gifted and saintly character and a former friend and disciple of Ruysbroeck. It is plain that à Kempis loved Radewyn and greatly revered him, and at that time and later, owed much to his influence.

In the year 1398 Thomas was taken to live with the Brethren—a group of priests and lay brothers who lived under Rule, but not under Life Vows, and whose holy and disciplined lives à Kempis warmly describes. During the year or two spent in this House he received careful training, mental and spiritual, and was taught to "write neatly," no mean art in those days. He earned money by copying manuscripts in beautiful script, and Radewyn saw he had all he needed.

From a portrait made later we can readily picture the lad. Of somewhat short stature, ruddy-faced, with brown eyes of excellent vision which long years of close writing were to leave unimpaired, a trace of the stoop of the penman—so we see him. It is said he was shy, and abstraction from things of mere time and absorption in those of eternity must early have made itself felt, for Florentius Radewyn told him he was meant for the life of a monk—an opinion in which his disciple agreed.

So in 1399 Thomas removed to the newly established Mount St. Agnes Monastery, where his brother at that time was Prior, to remain there for almost the whole of his life, and there to die. Thomas à Kempis did not take Final Vows until seven years after he entered Religion, and it was later still, in 1413, that he was ordained to the priesthood.

There, after the manner of those who walk "out of the world"—he had scarcely been in it!—à Kempis no doubt would have vanished, save from the sight of his God and his Order, but for the writings he left, and especially this book, *Of the Imitation of Christ.*

In the Monastery Thomas appears to have been greatly beloved, although as a rule he sought solitude rather than company and at times would escape from his fellows on the plea that "Some One" in his cell awaited his presence. He served as Master of Novices, as Procurator for a short time and twice as Sub-Prior. But his principal work was that of a copyist and writer of spiritual treatises.

Of the long dispute as to whether à Kempis was really the author of this book he wrote and arranged, it suffices to say here that the weight of evidence is on that side. He was commonly believed so in his lifetime, as written records expressly state, and this belief has been much re-enforced by unbiased modern research. Small parts of the *Imitation* may be borrowed, for in an age before copyrights existed men freely and unashamedly used and adapted the writings of others. Moreover,

Thomas had early been schooled in the mystical tradition by Florentius Radewyn, and we know that the Canons of Mount St. Agnes were wont to confer on spiritual subjects. That many copies of the book were circulated unsigned is not surprising, for a monk, and all fruits of his labours, belong to his Order.

The *Imitation* is written in four sections—"Books" the author calls them. In many editions we have as fourth and final Book that which à Kempis placed as *third*. In any case, whether interposed or added, *Concerning the Communion* is somewhat apart from the central theme—that of growing union with God—for it deals, not with the stages of spiritual life, but with the sacramental means thereto.

To the volume as a whole à Kempis gave no name, though he called the beginning of Book I. *Of the Imitation of Christ*. The work was also known as *The Ecclesiastical Music*, a title referring, plainly, to that inner music, the attuning of the soul of man to the will of his Maker, of which many mystics tell us. But the writing itself has a rhythmical form (sometimes even an actual rhyme). This, however, is not constant and depends very largely upon the Latin inflections, and for this reason *metrical* renderings are rarely faithful translations. Better far are those versions which, while keeping close to the Latin original and preserving some rhythm, divide the passages sharply, as in our Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. That à Kempis uses this form is surely chiefly explained by his training from boyhood in, and daily repeated use of, the Plainchant. Since he probably meant the book to be chanted or read in refectory, he might half unconsciously use this method, so part was it of himself. One of the few things told of his life as a monk is of his care and fervour in chanting the Office, standing always very erect, and often on tiptoe, with face and eyes uplifted.

At this point perhaps some reader may feel the *Imitation* a book hardly intended for the ordinary, workaday person. But facts contradict such a conclusion. Everywhere human nature is much the same, and the reader will meet within these covers some of his best ideals.

True, Thomas à Kempis was a loyal, unquestioning son of his Church, a priest, and a monk, addressing especially monks, but though the *Imitation* is framed in that setting, the principles laid down and applied are those of the Gospels. He is concerned not with polemics but with the vital and practical business of guiding those readers who are already, or will be, followers of Christ. That, later, some might appraise the book chiefly for beauty and literary merit would, surely, have pained and astonished its author, to whom Christ, and companionship with Him, made up the whole meaning of life.

For his purpose he uses the well-worn map of the mystics, comprising three stages—the "Ways" of Purgation, Illumination, and Union—by which the soul is re-formed, con-formed, and trans-formed to the likeness of Christ. The first three Books seem roughly to follow this plan—though the "Ways" intersect, as they do in reality—for the whole idea of succession in relation to God and ourselves is somewhat misleading, since all change is in us, not in Him. Nor does à Kempis, like some of the mystics, dwell much on the landscape as such, or encourage the counting of milestones. Rather, he points to the goal, then sets us to clear away hindrances, urging our wills to the task by making plain at the outset how well worth the labour will prove. So he brings forth from his vast stores of experience such motives for taking the road,

such countless aids and incentives, such simple compassionate warnings, enforced with such art of persuasion, that no wonder, through over four centuries, very many have heard and responded.

The second and third Books differ much from the first both in content and style. À Kempis now treats of more intimate themes, of regions where faith has attained some measure of sight, and the following of Christ has become "familiar friendship with Jesus." And, since such intercourse alters all values, the reader is shewn not only the wonder and joy of it, but the deepening humility and charity, the patient acceptance of pain, which are the true marks of Christ's lovers; and Thomas dwells much on God's goodness and his own most imperfect response. Book III. takes the form of a colloquy in which Christ and His servant alternately speak—pages inviting to prayer and not comment. Throughout those fifty-nine chapters we are conscious that à Kempis is using, for our sakes, the best means he knows to express a life, secret —eluding expression.

Of the fourth Book no more can be said here than it ranks very high as a devotional treatise on Holy Communion. Linked with the rest of à Kempis's teaching, it serves as a useful and needed reminder that physical and transcendental are in this life inseparably joined, and the loftiest spirituality needs tangible means of support. Each follower of Christ must have Food for the Journey, and à Kempis points out that Christ Himself in Holy Communion is "the comfort of those who are here but travellers, and the everlasting fruition of saints."

VERITAS, C. H. N.

NOTE ON THE TRANSLATION OF *ἀγάπη*

IT is often taken for granted that the old translation "charity" should be entirely discarded in favour of "love." While the association of "charity" may be on the one hand too negative and on the other hand too material, it is not clear that "love" is an entirely adequate translation of the Greek word. It is possible that the difficulties often felt as to the practicability of the Christian ethical ideal are due in some measure to the associations of the English word "love." It may sometimes represent *ἔρως* rather than *ἀγάπη*, and even when it does not do so, it is apt to bear an emotional tinge. Perhaps we may say that while "love" denotes a *sentiment*, *ἀγάπη* denotes what for want of a better word we may perhaps call a *policy*. It is a way of treating our fellow men, rather than a feeling we are to have about them. In 1 Cor. xiii. St. Paul describes *ἀγάπη* by saying how it behaves, not what it feels like.

The advantage of keeping "charity" as well as "love" as a translation of the Greek word would be that it is a reminder that we have really no exact English equivalent.

Is it a fact that the Latin Fathers, Augustine for example, use *diligo*, *dilectio*, *caritas*, rather than *amor*, *amo*?

R. J. MORRICE.

REGINA, CANADA.
Quinquagesima, 1938.

REVIEWS

THE ORIGIN OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles. 8s. 6d.

Within a compass of 229 pages M. Berdyaev has succeeded in tracing the events and currents of thought which led up to the Russian Revolution and the present régime in Russia. More than that, he has succeeded in shewing why communism is essentially a Russian phenomenon, and why it has proved and always will prove impossible to transfer it to any other country without its suffering radical change. Neither Germans nor English people need fear that their countries should become replicas of the U.S.S.R., for the simple reason that communism is as foreign to their ethos as it is indigenous to the Russian. " Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose " might be the rather despairing motto of M. Berdyaev's book; Lenin and the U.S.S.R. are the direct descendants of Ivan the Terrible and Moscow, the Third Rome, with its messianic mission; Peter the Great was a bolshevik type and his methods in bringing about reform were absolutely bolshevik. Behind it all, from the earliest times to the present day, stands a search for the kingdom founded on justice, coupled with incapacity to see anything but evil in what actually exists. M. Berdyaev shews his power as a writer perhaps in nothing so much as that he can yet gain the reader's sympathy for a nation which has produced and worshipped such strange gods as Ivan and Lenin, and which has produced a society whose fundamental principle one must abhor. If the will-power and power of enthusiastic affection inherent in the Russian temperament had been coupled not only with a capacity for dreaming dreams, but also for criticizing and intellectually working over these dreams, the fate of Russia might have been different. But Russians are Slavs, not Aryans, and they have the defect of their qualities; they can give themselves over to and be caught up by an ideal, but to wait patiently and make sure that the working plan emerging from the ideal is a worthy one, and in consonance with the end for which it has been devised, are beyond them. Doubt, and the fruitfulness of doubting and withholding assent while investigating details, are foreign to the Russian temperament; it demands and takes certainty by storm.

It is always hazardous to make generalizations about the characteristics of any nation, and doubly so when that nation inhabits so vast a territory and is divided into so sharply

distinguished groups as the Russian. But on the whole it must be said that M. Berdyaev makes good the generalization of his introductory chapter by the account he gives in following chapters of the groups who, voluntarily or involuntarily, played their part in the making of present-day Russia. The four most important groups are the Court and the peasants, both playing the passive part of providing the occasions for the development of Russian communism, and the intelligentsia and the narodnichestvo, who actively developed the idea of the communistic state and brought it to pass. It is with the two latter groups that M. Berdyaev is principally concerned, and rightly so. The Court was corrupt and oppressive, frightened and weak; the peasants were downtrodden and long-suffering; their contribution lay chiefly in the tenacity with which they retained the Russian conception of property, the strong conviction that all land belonged to God and should therefore belong to no one man. Once M. Berdyaev has summarized the acts of the Court and the attitude of the peasants, he leaves them alone; they form the necessary background for the story he is to tell, but not more. The same must be said with regard to the Church; it moulded the people, strengthened the ascetic element, imbued it with the idea of self-sacrifice for an idea; and then it passed into subservience to the Government during the Muscovite period with only half of its work done. Thus it comes about that it is in the activity and temper of the intelligentsia and the narodnichestvo that we are to search for an explanation of communism. M. Berdyaev follows the changing aspect of the revolutionary thought of these two groups from the conservative Hegelianism and mild socialism of the 1840's through repudiation of Hegel to Marxism and socialism, nihilism, anarchism, bolshevism, and communism. As both the intelligentsia and the narodnichestvo are entirely strange phenomena to Western thought, and as their ideas are apt to strike us as far-fetched, illogical dreams with no basis in reality, it is no mean feat to explain and make them intelligible to us. No one but a Russian with the necessary love and understanding of Russian character, and a philosopher bringing to his task the necessary detachment and psychological insight, could have accomplished it. M. Berdyaev accomplishes it by means of character-studies of the principal leaders; he shews us how Western thought was misunderstood by the Russian leaders, and why it must have been misunderstood in a country and by a people with so radically different a background. So we hear of Hertzen and Belinsky, Dobrolyubov and Chernishevsky, the influence of Comte and Herbert Spencer on the thought of the 1870's; later of Nechaev and

Bakunin; of Plekhanov, the founder of Russian Marxism, and Tkachev, the opponent of Engels. All are studies of character which by themselves would make the book worthy of a high place in historical literature. When we come to the modern period, the period of Trotsky and Lenin, the high level of character-study is not maintained; Lenin is a colourless figure as he is described here, compared, for instance, with Belinsky or Bakunin. But perhaps this was unavoidable.

M. Berdyaev devotes one chapter to "Russian Nineteenth Century Literature and its Predictions"; and all who are interested in Russian literature should read this. Leo Tolstoi was a narodnik; but in reading his books we are apt to discount the specific narodnik element in them, and so we misunderstand the character of Leo Tolstoi; his work for and with the peasants cannot be regarded as an instance of Franciscan impatience with property; it was so much more; it sprang from the deep sense of guilt in owning land, and a mystical belief in the truth hidden in the life of the common people.

In his final pages M. Berdyaev turns to "the fundamental problem of communism, the problem of the relation between man and society." Communism in actual fact, for him, is the dehumanization of social life, of man himself. Communism has stimulated Christian conscience, and it should lead to the development of "a creative social Christianity," by which M. Berdyaev means a Christianity that stands for truth and righteousness in social life; as Christianity in the ancient world saved man from the dehumanizing influence of demonolatry by its message of God as the arbiter of man's fate, so Christianity in the modern world should save man from dehumanization by his modern demonolatry and technical discoveries, through its message of the value of the individual and his end as the Kingdom of God.

M. Berdyaev does not touch on the still wider question which his book must bring home to any thoughtful reader: How far, on the background of history, must we say that human values are dependent on economic conditions? *The Origin of Russian Communism* might be read as one long witness to the fact that the fate of man and all that he rightly cares for are through and through determined by his economic background; until one sees the book as a whole—the tale which is told is a tale of the power of ideas to change and mould the economic and material conditions of life.

GRETA HORT.

PRIESTHOOD. By various writers. Edited by Hubert S. Box, PH.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION. A short introduction to the Ars Artium, Regimen animarum. Hubert S. Box. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This important book which, incidentally, is marvellously cheap, should be widely read by the clergy. It covers practically the whole ground of the priestly life: it is written for the most part by experts: it is solid without being heavy: and if all the wise advice so generously poured out were adopted, we should have a transformed clergy; and in the next generation a laity also transformed.

The book begins where it ought to begin—with theology. It is notorious that the whole conception of priesthood is the object of continual criticism from the "left wing": at the same time the Evangelicals shy at it being applied to anyone except our Lord: and the modern plain man probably never thinks in these terms at all. That being so it was courageous of the Editor to entrust the article to Mr. Baverstock, whose reputation as an advanced Anglo-Catholic and a die-hard traditionalist would not help him to overcome the particular prejudices which it falls to him to dispel. The venture is well justified. The author of the essay knows exactly the boundary line between explaining the Catholic attitude and explaining away Catholic doctrine. He never trails his coat; but neither does he give away the contents of its pockets. He succeeds very admirably in fitting the doctrine of ministerial priesthood into its true setting in the general body of theology. He insists as firmly as anyone could wish on the fundamental truth that Priesthood is primarily the appanage of Christ: he clears away masses of inadequate and disproportioned teaching by shewing that sacrifice is not the only function of Priesthood; and by his clear statement that in conferring holy Orders the "Bishop is not acting as the substitute of an absent Christ, but as the chosen instrument of the living Lord" he explodes the figments of crude ecclesiasticism.

The next two articles, by Fr. Symonds and Dr. Cross, form a pair, in which it is pointed out that whatever terminology is used the ministerial office as described both in the New Testament and in the Church Orders is actually of a "priestly" character.

Fr. Biggart's article on The Priest as Minister of Grace has the acumen and the sprightliness which we should expect. He has a great and very useful power of extracting an elegant

sufficing of the essence of big books without presenting us with an indigestible concentration. The article is a defence of sacramentalism against modern attempts to decry it as a mere survival of magical conceptions.

Fr. Bedale writes as an expert on the Training of a Priest. His principal concern is to stress the need of a theological education. What is needed is not principally technique, but something much deeper, a grasp of the nature of that message from Heaven which is Christianity. Therefore, he considers the education of an ordinand should keep his ultimate life's work in view throughout. A degree course may or may not fulfil this qualification. But a "top-dressing of religious instruction" upon a pass degree or a course of chemistry or mathematics makes the serious teaching of theology impossible. A degree may mean much in the way of education, and even in the way of preparation for the priesthood; or it may mean almost nothing at all.

Mr. Jalland's article on the Priest and the Mass is written with great intelligence, as would be expected by those who have read *This our Sacrifice*. He is a supporter of what is called the Interim rite. No doubt there is much to be said for this rearrangement of Anglican material in such a way as to produce a more satisfactory canon than that of 1662. Probably the way out of liturgical chaos is to be looked for in this direction. But to say as he does that "the result would be a coherent, if somewhat jejune, Consecratory Thanksgiving and *Anamnesis*" seems to go beyond what can rightly be claimed for this expedient. It is the lack of any kind of anamnesis in the technical sense which deters some of us from championing the interim rite more vigorously. It is to be hoped that some will take note of the author's remarks on the use of the *Agnus Dei*. To sing this anthem without any pause immediately after the Consecration is to obliterate from the rite the whole idea of oblation. It is difficult to understand the arithmetic of the footnote on p. 168; neither 3 nor 4 is 6 per cent. of 20.

The Editor is responsible for the article on The Priest as Confessor. It is a difficult subject on which to say anything original and Dr. Box very wisely does not try to. Perhaps some more might profitably have been said on the obligations of Anglicans in the matter of sacramental confession. The doctrinal treatment is severely scholastic and dogmatic.

Mr. Donovan deals with the hackneyed subject of The Priest as Preacher with much wisdom, and will bring many a blush to the faces of those who try to preach.

Professor Rogers, writing on The Priest as Apologist,

wisely confines himself almost entirely to that branch of Apologetics on which he is an acknowledged expert—outdoor speaking. Not indeed that he magnifies its importance; for in his opinion the good that it does chiefly consists in the harm that would accrue if it were not done. But he wants far more of it, and thinks that most clergymen are quite capable of making themselves into effective outdoor apologists. I don't believe it!

Mr. Thompson, the author of The Priest as Teacher of Prayer, has much to say that is not only true but needs saying. The sections on "What the Priest must assume" and "What the Priest must know" are excellent. The theology of Prayer is well and clearly taught as, to take one example, in the author's remarks on Prayer to the Holy Spirit. The beginning and the end of the article are less happy. They are written with what may perhaps be called a pronounced "Oxford accent" and give the impression of immaturity and exaggeration. It is quite possible to dislike the idea of a (specifically) Children's Mass without calling it a monstrosity, or to be uncertain of the supreme value of the "Three Hours" without saying that it is "a perversion of sacred concerts." Nor is it easy to accept the paradox that to say one thing and think about another is a positive advance in mental prayer. A similar striving after paradox occasionally plunges us into complete obscurity as on pp. 308 and 309.

Dr. Sparrow Simpson provides some useful suggestions for a course of reading, which, as he reminds us, should be lifelong.

Fr. Pridham's searching and beautiful article on the Interior Life of the Priest hardly admits of short description. Its theme is life in Christ along the lines of prayer and mortification issuing in a transforming and renewing knowledge of God Himself.

Fr. Hebert's concluding article on the Church and the World makes a timely appearance in the year that has seen the great international conference on Church Community and State. The Church and the World are in conflict: "the modern age . . . is a more perfect embodiment of Antichrist than has been seen yet." But that is not the whole truth. There is such a thing as the Natural Law: and it is the duty of Christians to recall the minds of all men to this. There is a Natural Order, and the Christian Order is not something contrary to this, but its sanctification.

It is to be hoped that the volume will have a very wide circulation.

The little treatise on Direction by the Editor of *Priesthood*

is, as stated on the title-page, a compilation of maxims from Scaramelli, Baker, Faber and others. Spiritual direction, as distinguished from reasonable knowledge of the duties of a confessor, is almost a lost art: and it is probably necessary to begin by going back to the classic authorities. But we do need a modern Scaramelli, even if a modern Baker is hardly to be thought of.

✠ Kenneth Brechin.

Matthew, Mark and Luke. By John Chapman. Longmans. 25s.

Dom John Chapman, abbot of Downside, had written, before he died, and Mgr. Barton, Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, has edited, a book of which the chief purpose is to prove that St. Matthew's Gospel was written before St. Mark's Gospel.

It is implied that the Aramaic gospel of Matthew was written close on A.D. 42, and that St. Mark made his gospel of short-hand notes taken down from "lectures" delivered in Rome by St. Peter. St. Peter was there lecturing: a sort of running commentary on Matthew. This was before St. Paul arrived after his shipwreck—that would be somewhere, I suppose, between A.D. 60 and 64.

And the people who are called the "non-Catholic critics" would say something more like Mark A.D. 65 and Matthew A.D. 85.

That would seem to be a clear issue. It ought to be possible to come to a trustworthy opinion as to which is the truer.

The book has some 300 pages, more than 120 thousand words, and it is difficult to speak of it in 2,000 words. It is a book which deserves and compels careful reading. It is (if it is not impertinent to say so) sincere work. But I find it reminding me of the Alexandrian ship which brought St. Paul to Melita. The Ship of the Church has run aground. And the foreship—that is the "Pontifical Biblical Commission"—has stuck fast and remained immovable, and the stern—that is the "non-Catholic Critics"—is broken with the violence of the waves. There is nothing for it but to cast ourselves overboard and, some on planks and some on broken pieces of the ship, to swim ashore.

For, in truth, to say that Mark comes after and uses Matthew is something like saying that the 1175 Choir of William of Sens at Canterbury is older than the 1100 undercroft on which

it rests, or that the white chalk cliffs of Kent are older than the coal measures 1,000 feet underneath them. The authority that is to dictate like that cannot believe that the mind of man was meant to think thoughts.

The story of Dom Chapman's conversion is, psychologically, of great interest. In May, 1912, he had received a civil post-card from Dr. von Harnack congratulating him on an article in writing which (he says) "I assumed for the sake of argument, that Matthew and Luke had both used 'Q.'" He calls this an "obvious fault."

In June, 1912, a decree was issued as the result of the work of the Biblical Commission, which, Dom Chapman says, "did not recommend" the Two-document Hypothesis. The Editor adds a grim note: "This is too mild. 'Definitely rejected' would be more accurate." This is June, 1912. Dom Chapman "at the end of 1915" was "converted" and confesses his "obvious fault." He had in 1912 been "rooted in my self-sufficiency." He is now ashamed of having been attracted by the "Q" hypothesis.

He found in Mk. iv. 2 and 33, 34, and in Mk. xii. 38, that Mark was "confessing" that he was copying Matthew, and leaving out some of his original.

"Non-Catholic critics" will look again at the verses. And they will wonder how such a meaning can have been found in words which tell that Jesus taught in parables and, again, words which suggest no more than that Mark felt disinclined to quote the whole of a Saying which Luke also shortens, though Matthew seems to have found it congenial and even to have added to it. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!"

This use by Matthew, Mark and Luke of a single tradition will serve as a point of departure for my complaints of the hostility of Dom Chapman to the "Q" hypothesis. He varies his treatment of "Q," he is grave and gay by turns, but he is always unfair.

Time and again, when he triumphs over the "non-Catholic critics" because he pushes them back to admit that Mark uses "Q," I have felt, Well! but Mark does use "Q." I know that. But that does not bring Matthew a year nearer to A.D. 45, or a year earlier than A.D. 85. Mark! What is the date of Mark? They say A.D. 65. But Mark is of two dates. It was rewritten in A.D. 65, but some of it—perhaps a third of it—is older than that. Mark is, partly, what John Mark wrote down of Peter's preaching, and, in A.D. 65, this gospel was rewritten by someone who, among other things, used "Q" or something very like the "Q" of which we conjecture that

two copies of another version were used by Matthew and Luke. Who can forbid that to be so ?

This A.D. 65 Marcan Gospel was used by Matthew and Luke who had, among other things, *their* " Q " to help, and wrote in A.D. 80 and 90 the Gospels as we read them now.

If you will read through Matthew, supposing that this is the explanation of the first Gospel being what it is, you will find few difficulties. I have watched for such with Dom Chapman's help, and am surprised to find how few they are.

Neither Mark nor Matthew, as I see them, are such as Dom Chapman wants to manœuvre me into a position of saying that they are. Neither is the " Q " hypothesis the hypothesis which he says I " must " defend or surrender ! I shake my mind free of his bantering and ask, what is here ? What is this Matthew which he dates A.D. 45 and I date 85 ? Matthew, for example, has some material which is, no doubt, as old as A.D. 45. I dare say " Q " is that. And I dare say whatever is copied from the first Marcan Gospel is that. That genealogy, too, in Matthew, which makes Jesus the Messiah and not the Son of God, the descendant of Joseph and David and Abraham, may be of great antiquity. By the time when our Christmas story was written, that genealogy would have been differently composed. Or the passage Matt. x. 6, 23: " Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. When they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

That is no doubt of great antiquity. It serves to mark the difference of date between itself and Matt. xxviii. 19: " Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . ." and the rest.

And there are the " proof-texts," too, which do not come originally from Hellenistic Churches. They cannot depend on the Greek of the Septuagint—for example, Matt. xii. 18-21, " That it might be fulfilled which was spoken . . ." words which Matthew has a dozen times. These proof-texts may go back to an Aramaic-speaking Church, which was proving that Jesus is Messiah because He fulfils the prophecies. But a reader will look to see whether the writing in which they are embedded is of the same age. He will go on from Matt. xii. 18, 19, 20, 21 to Matt. xii. 22, and I ask the reader to attend there to one word: the word " Blind."

This man " possessed with a devil . . . dumb." He was a dumb man in Matt. ix. 33. And he was dumb in Lk. xi. 14. But here his eyes have been put out. Why ? Because

Matthew has looked up his traditional Old Testament quotation in the LXX and made use of some of its words, and from Isa. xlii. 6 he has taken the word "Blind": "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes." It is a late hand that has written this word "Blind."

Or that text Matt. xxi. 5 from Zech. xiv. 4, "meek, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." By A.D. 85, that had been quoted, no doubt, many times by Christians, Jewish-minded enough to know that there is but one ass. The proof-text may go far back, but no Jew who was converted in "June A.D. 28" would so misunderstand the prophecy and the story of its fulfilment. A Christian, Jewish-born, Greek-speaking Rabbi in A.D. 85, in Antioch, might conceivably set a rider on two asses, in mistaken reverence for the text of Zechariah, but he would still be a Syrian. And a Syrian would still think in such phrases as "the Kingdom of heaven," and not "the Kingdom of God." He would think and talk of "Gentiles" as Luke would not. In "Q's" version of our Lord's Sayings, Matt. v., vi., vii., he would include much that Luke would leave out, words about hypocrisy as it was seen in Jerusalem, etc. He would regard Christianity as a New Law; Christ as the Messiah of the House of David, and he would regard as his enemies, with a hostility unknown to Christians in Rome, the Scribes and Pharisees hypocrites, of "Q" and of Matt. xxiii.

Compare the hate of Matt. xxiii. with a scene in Mark (Mk. xii. 34): "one of the scribes came . . ." "and Jesus . . . said unto him, Thou art not far from 'the kingdom of heaven.'"

I think it would take time for the Church to conceive a Jesus who had moved from Mk. xii. 34 to Matt. xxiii. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33. It is a long journey of the mind and a sad one.

This is a battle which must be fought all along the line and I can only observe it at one or two points. For one, I will single out Mk. viii., ix.; Matt. xvi., xvii. I believe that in our earliest Marcan tradition we have Peter answering: "Thou art the Messiah." I believe that the later Marcan writer wrote the Gospel again to bring into view the aspect of Jesus as the Son of God. Mk. viii. 27-29 tells of Messiah. Mk. ix. 2-8 tells of a Vision, God's voice: "This is my beloved Son." The one is of A.D. 29, 30. The other is written A.D. 64, 65. St. Mark, as we read him now, has been observed to have taken as the plot of his story, the "Messianic Secret." It is one of the proofs of the *secondness* of Matthew that this, which runs so clear in the Marcan Gospel in the first nine chapters of our St. Mark, has become obscured in Matthew. The first

stage, then, was "Thou art Messiah." The second stage was to supplement this with a more than Messianic revelation. Mark the Second has composed the Transfiguration scene. And the third stage is Matthew of Antioch? A.D. 85? not realizing the meaning of the old words, the awe with which it would be said, "Thou art Messiah." He rewrites the Second Mark. Matt. xvi. 13 has, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" That would be giving both question and answer. And it is an anachronism. The Son of man is a Name, not of A.D. 29, 30, but of the Church expecting (from Dan. vii.) the Lord to return on the clouds, immediately. They expected that from A.D. 30 onwards. And Peter's answer in Matt. xvi. 15 is: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That is, again, an anachronism. It was a week later (Mk. ix. 2), or else a generation later (in A.D. 65), that Peter heard the Voice, "This is my beloved Son."

Then this anachronism—let it be six days only—is followed, in Matt. xvi. 17-19, by three verses of something which Dom Chapman says St. Peter left out from his Matthew Gospel in his lectures at Rome (in A.D. 60?) because of his great modesty. When he came to the passage in Matthew, which was written either fifteen years before or twenty-five years after, he left it out.

St. Peter left out: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of the heavens, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." It is agreed by all that it matters much whether the words were written down shorthand on wax tablets at the time in A.D. 30, or were evolved during fifty-five years in a Church divided by loyalties to James and Paul and Peter and coming to rest in a loyalty to Peter, arbiter about Jewish Laws and Christian life.

I pass to the Sermon on the Mount. We are asked to believe —not "playfully" asked, I believe, though Dom Chapman was sometimes "playful"—we are asked to believe that two shorthand reporters took down the Sermon, which is of "the Mount" in Matthew, and of "the Plain" in Luke. And Matthew's report took down seven Blessings and had no time for the Woes. But Luke's report missed three Blessings and so had time for four Woes. Whether is saner, such a view as this or the "non-Catholics'" view of these Sayings, that they were such Sayings as dwelt in the hearts of many hearers? They were Sayings which could not be listened to by the score: Sayings that could not be received in one "discourse," all strung together. They were too great for that. They floated in loving memories, and, it may be fifteen years later, when the

first Christian Greek was written they became part of this mocked and scourged and spat upon and still most precious and beautiful "Q" document of our conjecture: the nearest we can come to listening to that Voice in Galilee.

300 pages, closely argued, require an equal answer, perhaps. But no true answer to these questions which all minds must face which with honest intelligence think about the story of Jesus: no true answer can be reached if minds allow themselves to be deflected from a straight looking to see what is there by a sidelong glance at what they will be permitted to see by some authority which says: "You may think, but you must think this, or this! You may look, but you must see there what we tell you!" Canterbury, the daughter, has a great veneration for her Mother, Rome. But minds cannot think at all on Monsignor Barton's terms. "Nihil Obstat?" Oh, but!

> Brutus had rather be a villager
> Than to repute himself a son of Rome
> Under these hard conditions.

J. M. C. Crum.

NOTICES

RICHARD PORSON. By M. L. Clarke. Cambridge University Press. 6s. net.

This story of Porson's life is a model of what such a monograph should be; and the portrait which it gives of Porson's personality is all the more effective because it is penned with all the fidelity to detail, the economy of judgment, and the clarity of style which we associate with the scholarship of his University.

Born in 1759 of humble Norfolk parentage, Porson shewed such proficiency as a boy in mathematics and in Latin as to win the kindly notice of neighbouring clergy and gentry, who subscribed to send him in his fifteenth year to Eton. There he astounded his masters by his memory, wrote a play—*Out of the Frying Pan into the Fire*—which would surely make good entertainment at a Public School today, and took part in the rat-hunting which—*experto crede*—was still necessary in College in the early years of the present century. Greek was not at this time one of his strongest subjects; but after going up to Trinity in 1778, and still more after his election to a Fellowship in 1782, he made it more and more his study. In 1792 Porson was confronted with the choice between taking Orders or quitting his Fellowship—a choice which seems to have been forced upon him by the nepotism of the then Master of Trinity; and it was only the generosity of friends and admirers in raising a capital sum to provide him with an annuity, together with his election in the following year to the Professorship of Greek, which saved Porson's gifts for classical scholarship. As it was, he neither resided nor lectured in Cambridge, but lived in London, where he contributed to the literary journalism of the day. In 1796 he surprised his friends by marrying, and seems to have been as absent-minded about his wedding as Louis Pasteur was at a later date. But his wife died after a few months, and Porson returned to the Bohemian life which he enjoyed. His own death occurred in 1808.

When the present writer was at Cambridge, there was a story about Porson which wittily illustrates his character. It was told how, when going to bed one night with a candle in one hand and some whisky in the other, he slipped on the staircase and found his hands empty; at which he remarked, *οὐδὲ τόδε οὐδὲ τἀλλό*. Mr. Clarke makes no concealment of Porson's convivial habits, but reminds us that the code of those days was different from ours. His intemperance, at any rate, though it probably shortened his life, did not impair the accuracy of his scholarship nor the brilliance of his wit; nor would he compromise his conscience in regard either to religious belief or to politics. And he had an unworldly attitude towards money and fame which was rare then and is rare now. Though his work lay in the restricted field of the grammar and textual criticism of Attic drama, he founded a tradition of exact scholarship which had great influence in the century following his death. As Mr. Clarke observes, "he should be remembered as a great scholar who knew Greek as few if any others have known it, and also as a man gifted with wit and character, something more than a mere

academic figure, and more than a mere eccentric." A succession of Porson prizemen and scholars who have been the beneficiaries of the income that was raised for him in 1792, bear witness to the admiration he inspired and to his own generous forethought; and if the classics seem to be fighting a losing battle today with other and easier courses of education, Mr. Clarke's charming book gives some ground for the hope that they will come into their own again.

E. G. SELWYN.

CARDINAL MERRY DEL VAL. By Monsignor Dalpiaz. Burns Oates. 7s. 6d.

Monsignor Dalpiaz investigates less the career of the renowned statesman than that of the man of God this book sets out to prove him to be. Naturally one wonders how many men were contained within the brain of the Cardinal. There is a short chapter on his career as Cardinal Secretary of State, and the reader who turns to this chapter for revelations on the foreign policy of the papacy will turn in vain. For example, suppose we wish to know the truth of what is probably the last time Austria exercised the veto at a papal election. What are we told ? We are simply told that Cardinal Puzyna on behalf of the Emperor Francis Joseph exercised this veto, and that the act " caused such a sensation." Before presenting the veto against Cardinal Rampolla at the session for the scrutiny, Cardinal Puzyna informed Monsignor Merry del Val, as he then was, of the mandate he had received from the Austrian Emperor. Monsignor Merry del Val endeavoured to persuade Cardinal Puzyna to give up his plan. He refused to do so—how could he in the face of the command of the Emperor ?—and the Cardinal Dean was also unable to influence him. In spite of this, Cardinal Puzyna presented the veto, with the result that Cardinal Rampolla was not elected. There is nothing here that has not long since been known, and we certainly think that if the author cared he could present us with a very much fuller account of the share Monsignor Merry del Val took in trying to prevent the use of this veto.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE PEOPLE OF GOD. By Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

The Abbot of Buckfast is concerned in this book with a theme too little expounded by theologians yet a very fascinating one—namely, the solidarity of the Catholic Church as the People of God. The subject is a vast one, perhaps too vast for so small a book; nevertheless, the ground is covered. The result is, however, not so successful as might be wished. The theme is magnificent and should be full of attraction, yet it somehow misses fire. The reason seems to be that we have a prophetic subject dealt with after the manner of the scribes, an excellent exposition of the Catholic's relationship to God and all that it involves, but little or no appeal to the imagination, the conscience or the will. The evils of our civilization are mostly referred to in abstract terms, " laicization," " secularization " and the like, so that they hardly live at all, and if they do there is no suggestion that the Catholic has any responsibility in their regard. The Catholic needs comfort in these difficult days and this is a comfortable book, but too much comfort becomes complacency and

we could have wished for something rather more astringent; but perhaps Dom Vonier would send us back to the prophets for that.

F. P. HARTON.

THE REDEEMER. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. Longmans. 6s.

The Atonement is, as Dr. Sparrow Simpson says, a "momentous" subject, yet good books upon it are hard to come by; in this volume we have, within a reasonable compass, a comprehensive study which is scholarly, judicious, Catholic and, at the same time, readable. The author begins admirably with a consideration of the Character of God, then deals with the theology of Sacrifice in the Old Testament and the New leading up to our Lord's teaching about His death; this is followed by chapters on Redemption as Reconciliation, Sacrifice and Priesthood, an excellent exposition of the historic interpretations of the Atonement, chapters on Reparation and the Eucharistic Sacrifices, ending with one on the appeal of Christ to the human race.

"The modern mind," as Dr. Sparrow Simpson remarks, "is in a state of vagueness about redemption." This book should do much to remove the vagueness. It is eminently a book for the Parish Priest and we hope it will be widely read and thoughtfully assimilated.

F. P. HARTON.

ARMINIANISM. By A. W. Harrison, B.Sc., D.D., Principal of Westminster College, London. Duckworth. 5s.

Arminianism is the name given to the doctrines of Jacobus Arminius that were condemned at the Synod of Dort in 1619. They were the first resounding protest against the extreme Puritan tenets of election and reprobation, which under the ægis of Martin Luther and Calvin had for fifty years held almost undisputed sway among Protestants. As late as 1595 Archbishop Whitgift in the so-called Lambeth Articles would have fastened these doctrines, though not in their most extreme form, on the Church of England. Fortunately the younger school of theologians, notably Lancelot Andrewes and Overall, opposed him and found valuable support in Queen Elizabeth. Later on Laud and his followers were denounced by the Puritan party as Arminians, and they were hated as much for their genuine Arminianism as for their alleged Popery. The promotion of Richard Montague to be successively royal chaplain and Bishop of Chichester and Norwich as a reward for his Anti-Calvinistic tracts, roused the Puritans to fury and was a contributory cause of the Civil War.

In the next century John Wesley, as became his High Church ancestry, was an Arminian, but the Evangelicals in the Church of England were for the most part Calvinists, as were Baptists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

The nineteenth century saw a great weakening of rigid predestination doctrines, which in England are now held by comparatively few.

The author has given an interesting and learned sketch of Arminianism. It is a great boon to have a monograph on the subject and the book should be most useful. We can heartily commend it.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

CALLED OF GOD. Notes on some Questions concerning the Religious Life. By Lucius Cary, S.S.J.E. With a Preface by the Bishop of Wakefield. Mowbray.

Father Cary has given us a timely book. Those interested in the Religious Life have for some years past been watching with hope, not always unmingled with anxiety, the possible outcome of the conferences between the Bishops and the Religious Communities which have now resulted in the setting up of an Advisory Council for the adjudication of issues which might arise. The fact that the Council has now been organized on a practical working basis does not dispose of all the problems, and it is Father Cary's purpose to call serious and sympathetic attention to certain principles which will, from time to time, require explication.

The author disclaims any intention of writing a treatise on the general structure of the Religious Life; but while he has not dealt with details, no one who reads the book can fail to see that he has explained with singular wisdom and clarity the principles upon which the Life must be built, and upon which all dealing with the Life must be based. One of the best contributions the book offers is the well-knit argument that the Religious Life is the specific creation of God.

"First and foremost and continually it must be remembered," he says, "that the Religious believes himself to have received a divine vocation, and in that faith has made this special renunciation of the world. The state is not of his creation, nor is it ordained primarily for his salvation or perfection, but for the purposes of God deep within the life of the Church. . . . It is not because the kind of spiritual life which is cultivated in the Religious State is lacking in the Body at large that certain persons are called upon to supply it; but it is precisely that it is there as an essential element in the whole that Religious are called upon to foster it in a special degree."

If this thesis can be understood and accepted, most of the problems which have perplexed the Church in the revival of the Life amongst us will be seen to be no longer problems, but only elements requiring an adjustment which will prove easy if not automatic.

With all his optimism, Father Cary faces squarely the attendant dangers. For example, no Bishop, newly come to his see, is bound by the action or attitude of his predecessor; and a new appointment might in a few days change the atmosphere from one of sympathy to that of criticism if not of antagonism, to the great distress of Communities established under the fatherly care of a predecessor. Father Cary wisely suggests an act of faith in this regard. Plans have to be tried out, and patience exercised, and, in any event, a certain amount of revision would almost surely be necessary. Having in mind divergent views, he proposes, a little too apologetically perhaps, the setting up of a central authority to which appeal can be made, and which will be "both representative in character and constant in policy." Such a course would seem imperative if there is to be any persistent unity in co-operation.

S. C. HUGHSON, O.H.C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher